

RESTRICTION ESTIMATES USING POLYNOMIAL PARTITIONING II

LARRY GUTH

ABSTRACT. We improve the estimates in the restriction problem in dimension $n \geq 4$. To do so, we establish a weak version of a k -linear restriction estimate for any k . This weak k -linear estimate is essentially sharp for all k and n .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let E denote the extension operator for the paraboloid. Viewed as an oscillatory integral operator, we can write E in the following way. If B^{n-1} denotes the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $f : B^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a function, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then we define

$$(1.1) \quad Ef(x) := \int_{B^{n-1}} e^{i(x_1\omega_1 + \dots + x_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} + x_n|\omega|^2)} f(\omega) d\omega.$$

Stein [S] conjectured that the extension operator should obey the inequality $\|Ef\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(B^{n-1})}$ for all $p > 2 \cdot \frac{n}{n-1}$. We prove new partial results towards this conjecture in dimension $n \geq 4$. The best previous estimate was proven by Bourgain and the author in [BG]. The polynomial partitioning approach to the restriction problem was introduced in [G], which gave new bounds in dimension $n = 3$. The present paper combines this idea with the multilinear approach from [BG].

Theorem 1.1. *For $n \geq 2$, the operator E obeys the estimate*

$$(1.2) \quad \|Ef\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(B^{n-1})},$$

if

$$(1.3) \quad p > 2 \cdot \frac{3n+1}{3n-3} \text{ for } n \text{ odd}.$$

$$(1.4) \quad p > 2 \cdot \frac{3n+2}{3n-2} \text{ for } n \text{ even}.$$

This estimate is the best current estimate for $n \geq 4$. For $n = 4$, Theorem 1.1 gives the range $p > 2.8$. The best previous estimate was $p > 3$, proven by Tao in [T2] (and with a different proof in [BG]). For large n , our lower bound for p is $2 + \frac{8}{3}n^{-1} + O(n^{-2})$. The best previous estimate ([BG]) gave a lower bound of the form $2 + 3n^{-1} + O(n^{-2})$.

The new ingredient of our argument has to do with algebraic structure. Roughly speaking, the argument shows that if $\|Ef\|_{L^p}$ is large, then the region where $|Ef|$ is large has some algebraic structure – it must be organized into thin neighborhoods of low degree algebraic varieties. Exploiting this structure leads to improved bounds on $\|Ef\|_{L^p}$.

We find this algebraic structure using the tool of polynomial partitioning, which was introduced by Nets Katz and the author in [GK]. The paper [GK] proves that if a set of lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$ has many intersection points, then the lines must be organized into a small number of low degree algebraic surfaces. The technique builds on Dvir's solution of the finite field Kakeya problem [D] and on the cutting method from combinatorial geometry, introduced by Clarkson, Edelsbrunner, Guibas, Sharir, and Welzl [CEGSW]. The first applications of polynomial partitioning were in combinatorics, but Wolff applied the cutting method to Fourier analysis in [W2] and [W3], suggesting the applications we pursue here.

Theorem 1.1 follows from a weak version of a k -linear restriction estimate. To describe k -linear estimates, we first recall some basic facts about wave packet decompositions. Suppose we want to study Ef on a large ball $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. We decompose the domain B^{n-1} into balls θ of radius $R^{-1/2}$. Then we decompose f in the form

$$f = \sum_{\theta, v} f_{\theta, v},$$

where $f_{\theta, v}$ is supported in θ and has Fourier transform essentially supported in a ball around v of radius $R^{1/2}$. In the sum, θ ranges over our set of finitely overlapping balls covering B^{n-1} and v ranges over $R^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$. For each pair (θ, v) , the restriction of $Ef_{\theta, v}$ to B_R is essentially supported on a tube $T_{\theta, v}$ with radius $R^{1/2}$ and length R . The direction of this tube depends only on θ , and we denote it by $G(\theta) \in S^{n-1}$.

We can now describe multilinear restriction estimates. Given subsets $U_1, \dots, U_k \subset B^{n-1}$, we say that they are transverse if, for any choice of $\theta_j \subset U_j$, the directions $G(\theta_1), \dots, G(\theta_k)$ are quantitatively transverse in the sense that

$$(1.5) \quad |G(\theta_1) \wedge \dots \wedge G(\theta_k)| \gtrsim 1.$$

Building on important work of Wolff [W1], Tao [T2] proved a sharp bilinear estimate for the extension operator E .

Theorem 1.2. (*2-linear restriction, [T2]*) *If $U_1, U_2 \subset B^{n-1}$ are transverse, and f_j is supported in U_j , then*

$$(1.6) \quad \left\| \prod_{j=1}^2 |Ef_j|^{1/2} \right\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim R^\epsilon \prod_{j=1}^2 \|f_j\|_{L^2(B^{n-1})}^{1/2}$$

for $p \geq 2 \cdot \frac{n+2}{n}$.

By an argument of Tao, Vargas, and Vega, [TVV], this bilinear estimate implies that $\|Ef\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^p(B^{n-1})}$ in the same range $p \geq 2 \cdot \frac{n+2}{n}$.

(By the ϵ -removal theorem ([T1]), if E obeys the estimate $\|Ef\|_{L^q(B_R)} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^q}$, then $\|Ef\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p}$ for all $p > q$.)

A few years later, Bennett, Carbery, and Tao [BCT] proved a sharp n -linear estimate for E .

Theorem 1.3. (*n -linear restriction, [BCT]*) *If $U_1, \dots, U_n \subset B^{n-1}$ are transverse, and f_j is supported in U_j , then*

$$(1.7) \quad \left\| \prod_{j=1}^n |Ef_j|^{1/n} \right\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim R^\epsilon \prod_{j=1}^n \|f_j\|_{L^2(B^{n-1})}^{1/n}$$

for $p \geq 2 \cdot \frac{n}{n-1}$.

This theorem is important and remarkable in part because it involves the sharp exponent for the restriction problem: $p > 2 \cdot \frac{n}{n-1}$. The paper [BG] gives a technique to exploit multilinear restriction estimates in order to get improved estimates on the original restriction problem. Since then, multilinear restriction has had many applications, including the striking recent work of Bourgain and Demeter on decoupling (see [BD] and many followup papers).

Given this 2-linear estimate and this n -linear estimate, it is natural to try to prove a k -linear estimate for all $2 \leq k \leq n$ which would include these two estimates as special cases. Here is what looks to me like the natural conjecture, which I first learned from Jonathan Bennett.

Conjecture 1.4. (*k-linear restriction*) If $U_1, \dots, U_k \subset B^{n-1}$ are transverse, and f_j is supported in U_j , then

$$(1.8) \quad \left\| \prod_{j=1}^k |Ef_j|^{1/k} \right\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim R^\epsilon \prod_{j=1}^k \|f_j\|_{L^2(B^{n-1})}^{1/k}$$

for $p \geq \bar{p}(k, n) := 2 \cdot \frac{n+k}{n+k-2}$.

For $3 \leq k \leq n-1$, this conjecture is open. The only progress on it is a very recent paper of Bejenaru [Be]. In [Be], Bejenaru proves a 3-linear estimate of this form for the extension operators of a class of curved hypersurfaces. The hypersurfaces he studies are foliated by 2-planes, which he exploits in the proof.

The main new result of this paper is a weak version of Conjecture 1.4, which we call a k -broad restriction inequality. To motivate this inequality, we consider the left-hand side of (1.8). Suppose that B is a small ball in B_R , and that all the wave packets that pass through B are pointing in directions that lie in a small neighborhood of a $(k-1)$ -plane. These wave packets cannot come from all k of the functions Ef_j : one of the functions Ef_j must vanish on B , and so B contributes nothing to the left-hand side of (1.8). In a k -broad estimate, for each small ball B , we discount the contributions of wave packets near to a few $(k-1)$ -planes. Here is the precise setup.

Following [BG], we decompose B^{n-1} into balls τ of radius K^{-1} , where K is a large constant. This decomposition is much coarser than the decomposition into balls θ of radius $R^{-1/2}$. We write $f = \sum_{\tau} f_{\tau}$ where f_{τ} is supported in τ . We will study the interaction between the different Ef_{τ} . We let $G(\tau) = \cup_{\theta \subset \tau} G(\theta)$. The set $G(\tau) \subset S^{n-1}$ is a spherical cap with radius $\sim K^{-1}$, representing the possible directions of wave packets in Ef_{τ} . If $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a subspace, then we write $\text{Angle}(G(\tau), V)$ for the smallest angle between any non-zero vectors $v \in V$ and $v' \in G(\tau)$.

Next we decompose B_R into much smaller balls. In our argument it is convenient to use balls of radius K^2 . (The paper [BG] uses balls of radius K , and that would also work here.) For each ball $B_{K^2} \subset B_R$, we consider $\int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_{\tau}|^p$ for every τ . We discount the contributions of f_{τ} with $G(\tau)$ lying near to a few $(k-1)$ -planes, and we record the largest remaining contribution. More formally, for a parameter A , we define

$$(1.9) \quad \mu_{Ef}(B_{K^2}) := \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \max_{\substack{(k-1)\text{-subspaces of } \mathbb{R}^n \\ \tau: \text{Angle}(G(\tau), V_a) > K^{-1} \text{ for all } a}} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^p.$$

We can now define the k -broad part of $\|Ef\|_{L^p(B_R)}$ by:

$$(1.10) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p := \sum_{B_{K^2} \subset B_R} \mu_{Ef}(B_{K^2}).$$

We can now state our main new result.

Theorem 1.5. *For any $2 \leq k \leq n$, and any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a large constant A so that the following holds (for any value of K):*

$$(1.11) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim_{K,\epsilon} R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2(B^{n-1})},$$

$$\text{for } p \geq \bar{p}(k, n) = 2 \cdot \frac{n+k}{n+k-2}.$$

Theorem 1.5 is a weak version of Conjecture 1.4. In particular, when $k = 2$, Theorem 1.5 follows from Theorem 1.2, and when $k = n$, Theorem 1.5 follows from Theorem 1.3. For $3 \leq k \leq n-1$, Theorem 1.5 is new.

The paper [BG] gives a technique for converting multilinear restriction estimates into linear restriction estimates. From the point of view of this technique, the k -broad inequality in Theorem 1.5 is just as good as the k -linear inequality in Conjecture 1.4. Using this technique, Theorem 1.5 implies the restriction estimate in Theorem 1.1.

The definition of $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$ is a little complex, so we pause to emphasize its good features.

- If all the wave packets of $Ef_{\theta,v}$ that intersect a ball B_{K^2} have direction $G(\theta)$ near a $(k-1)$ -plane, then B_{K^2} contributes nothing to $\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p}$. This is one of the main good features of the k -linear setup and we still have it in the k -broad setup.
- While $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$ is not literally a norm, it has some similar properties (which is why we use the norm notation). In particular, $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$ obeys the following weak version of the triangle inequality: if $f = g + h$, then

$$(1.12) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \lesssim \|Eg\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_R)} + \|Eh\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_R)}.$$

The reason for introducing the parameter A is to use this version of the triangle inequality. If we choose $A(\epsilon)$ very large, then we can effectively use the triangle inequality $O_\epsilon(1)$ times during our proof, and so $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$ behaves almost like a norm.

The range of exponents p in Theorem 1.5 is sharp. Next we discuss some examples.

In one example, the wave packets $Ef_{\theta,v}$ concentrate in the $R^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of a k -plane. We denote this neighborhood by W . Each wave packet $Ef_{\theta,v}$ has $|Ef_{\theta,v}(x)| \sim 1$ on the tube $T_{\theta,v}$, and rapidly decaying outside $T_{\theta,v}$. It is not hard to arrange that each point in the slab W lies in many wave packets $T_{\theta,v}$, pointing in many directions within the k -plane. For each ball B_{K^2} in the slab, only a tiny fraction of the wave packets through this ball lie near to any $(k-1)$ -plane. In this scenario, $\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \sim \|Ef\|_{L^p(B_R)}$. Also, if we choose random phases, then $|Ef(x)|^2 \sim \sum_{\theta,v} |Ef_{\theta,v}(x)|^2$ at most points x . We can distribute the wave packets evenly so

that $|Ef(x)|$ is roughly constant on the slab. Moreover, by a standard orthogonality argument $\|Ef\|_{L^2(B_R)} \sim R^{1/2}\|f\|_{L^2}$. Therefore, we get

$$\frac{\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}}{\|f\|_{L^2}} \sim R^{1/2} \frac{\|Ef\|_{L^p(B_R)}}{\|Ef\|_{L^2(B_R)}} \sim R^{1/2} |W|^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since $|W| \sim R^k R^{(1/2)(n-k)}$, a short calculation shows that the ratio $\|Ef\|_{L^p(B_R)}/\|f\|_{L^2}$ is bounded for $p \geq \bar{p}(k, n)$ and blows up for $p < \bar{p}(k, n)$.

But there are also more complicated sharp examples, coming from low degree algebraic varieties. This type of example was first pointed out to me by Josh Zahl. For instance, consider the quadric hypersurface $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ defined by

$$(x_1/R)^2 + (x_2/R)^2 - (x_3/R)^2 - (x_4/R)^2 = 1.$$

Each point of Z lies in a 1-parameter family of lines in Z , and the union of these lines form a 2-dimensional cone. For example, the point $(R, 0, 0, 0)$ lies in the cone defined by

$$x_1 = R; (x_2/R)^2 - (x_3/R)^2 - (x_4/R)^2 = 0.$$

If we take the $R^{1/2}$ -neighborhoods of lines in Z , we can find many tubes in the $R^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of Z . We can now build an example like the one above using wave packets concentrated in the $R^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of Z . For each ball B_{K^2} in this neighborhood, the wave packets through B_{K^2} fill out a 2-dimensional cone, and very few of them lie near any 2-dimensional plane. Therefore, $\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{3,A}^p(B_R)} \sim \|Ef\|_{L^p(B_R)}$. The rest of the discussion in the planar slab example applies here also, and so we see that this example is sharp for Theorem 1.5 in dimension 4 with $k = 3$.

For larger n , there are more variations on this example. The variety Z may be a hypersurface or it may have larger codimension. For each n , the degree of Z in the known examples is bounded in terms of n , but it can be larger than 2. Similar examples apply to Conjecture 1.4.

These examples help to suggest that algebraic varieties could be relevant to Theorem 1.5. Polynomial partitioning is a tool that helps us to find and exploit the type of algebraic structure in these examples. If we run through the proof of Theorem 1.5 on this last example, the argument will find the variety Z .

Acknowledgements. The author was supported by a Simons Investigator Award.

2. SKETCH OF THE PROOF

In this section, we sketch the proof of the k -broad estimate, Theorem 1.5. We actually give two sketches. The first sketch aims to show the main ideas of the argument. The second sketch brings into play more of the technical issues, and it provides a detailed outline of the argument in the paper.

The proof begins with a wave packet decomposition. We decompose the domain B^{n-1} into balls θ of radius $R^{1/2}$. We then decompose the function $f : B^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ as

$$f = \sum_{\theta, v} f_{\theta, v},$$

where $f_{\theta, v}$ is supported on θ and the Fourier transform of $f_{\theta, v}$ is essentially supported on a ball of radius $R^{1/2}$ around v . In the sum, v ranges over $R^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$. On B_R , $Ef_{\theta, v}$ is essentially supported

on a tube $T_{\theta,v}$ of radius $R^{1/2}$ and length R . In addition, the functions $f_{\theta,v}$ are essentially orthogonal. In particular, we have

$$(2.1) \quad \|f\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_{\theta,v} \|f_{\theta,v}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Our goal is to prove that

$$(2.2) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \leq C(\epsilon) R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2} \text{ for } p = \bar{p}(k, n) := \frac{2(n+k)}{n+k-2}.$$

The proof will be by induction. So we assume that 2.2 holds for balls of smaller radii, and in lower dimension.

Recall that

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p = \sum_{B_{K^2} \subset B_R} \mu_{Ef}(B_{K^2}),$$

where $\mu_{Ef}(B_{K^2})$ was defined in (1.9). We can extend μ_{Ef} to be a measure on B_R , making it a constant multiple of the Lebesgue measure on each B_{K^2} . In particular $\mu_{Ef}(B_R) = \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p$.

We now introduce polynomial partitioning. We let D be a large constant that we can choose later. For a polynomial P on $\mathbb{R}^n$, we write $Z(P)$ for the zero set of P . By Theorem 1.4 in [G], there is a (non-zero) polynomial P of degree at most D on $\mathbb{R}^n$, so that $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus Z(P)$ is a disjoint union of $\sim D^n$ open cells O_i , and the measures $\mu_{Ef}(O_i)$ are all equal.

Next we consider how the wave packets $Ef_{\theta,v}$ interact with this partition. We note that a line can cross $Z(P)$ at most D times, and so a line can enter at most $D+1$ of the $\sim D^n$ cells O_i . The tube $T_{\theta,v}$ can still enter many or all cells O_i , so we make the following modification. We define W to be the $R^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of $Z(P)$, and we define O'_i to be $O_i \setminus W$. If a tube $T_{\theta,v}$ enters O'_i , then the axis of $T_{\theta,v}$ must enter O_i , and so we get

$$(2.3) \quad \text{Each tube } T_{\theta,v} \text{ enters at most } D+1 \text{ cells } O'_i.$$

We now have

$$\mu_{Ef}(B_R) = \sum_i \mu_{Ef}(O'_i) + \mu_{Ef}(W).$$

We say that we are in the cellular case when the contribution of the cells dominates and in the algebraic case when the contribution of W dominates. If we are in the cellular case, then there must be $\sim D^n$ cells O'_i so that

$$(2.4) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim D^n \mu_{Ef}(O'_i).$$

Next we study Ef on each of these cells O'_i . We define f_i by

$$(2.5) \quad f_i := \sum_{\theta,v: T_{\theta,v} \cap O'_i \neq \emptyset} f_{\theta,v}.$$

Since $Ef_{\theta,v}$ is essentially supported on $T_{\theta,v}$, we see that Ef_i is almost equal to Ef on O'_i . Therefore, $\mu_{Ef_i}(O'_i) \sim \mu_{Ef}(O'_i)$. Now we study the $\mu_{Ef_i}(O'_i)$ using induction – since f_i involves fewer wave packets than f , it is a simpler object, and so it makes sense to assume by induction that our theorem holds for f_i . This leads to the following bound:

$$(2.6) \quad \mu_{Ef}(O'_i) \sim \mu_{Ef_i}(O'_i) \leq \|Ef_i\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim [C(\epsilon)R^\epsilon]^p \|f_i\|_{L^2}^p.$$

Next we analyze $\|f_i\|_{L^2}$. By the orthogonality of the $f_{\theta,v}$, we have

$$\sum_i \|f_i\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_i \sum_{\theta,v: T_{\theta,v} \cap O'_i \neq \emptyset} \|f_{\theta,v}\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_{\theta,v} |\# \text{ cells } O'_i \text{ so that } T_{\theta,v} \cap O'_i \neq \emptyset| \cdot \|f_{\theta,v}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

By (2.3), each tube $T_{\theta,v}$ enters $\lesssim D$ cells O'_i , and so we get

$$\sum_i \|f_i\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim D \sum_{\theta,v} \|f_{\theta,v}\|_{L^2}^2 \sim D \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Since there are $\sim D^n$ cells O'_i that obey (2.4), we see that most of them must also obey

$$(2.7) \quad \|f_i\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim D^{1-n} \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Combining this bound with (2.4) and our inductive assumption (2.6), we get

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \leq \left[CD^{n+(1-n)\frac{p}{2}} \right] [C(\epsilon)R^\epsilon]^p \|f\|_{L^2}^p.$$

In this equation, the constant C is the implicit constant from the various $\lesssim$'s. It does not depend on D . The induction closes as long as the term in brackets is ≤ 1 . Since we can choose the constant D , we can arrange that the induction closes as long as the exponent of D is negative. Given our value of p , we can check that the exponent of D is ≤ 0 , and the induction closes (with a little extra work if the exponent is zero). In fact, the exponent works out in our favor in the whole range of Stein's conjecture: $p > 2 \cdot \frac{n}{n-1}$.

Now we turn to the algebraic case. In this case, the measure μ_{Ef} is concentrated in W – the $R^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of $Z(P)$ – a degree D algebraic variety of dimension $n-1$. There are two types of wave packets that contribute to μ_{Ef} on W , which we describe roughly as follows:

- **Tangential wave packets:** wave packets that are essentially contained in W . For these wave packets, the direction of the tube $T_{\theta,v}$ is (nearly) tangent to $Z = Z(P)$.
- **Transverse wave packets:** wave packets that cut across W .

We first discuss the case that the tangential wave packets dominate. To simplify the exposition, let us imagine for the moment that the variety Z is a hyperplane, so W is a planar slab of dimensions $R^{1/2} \times R \times \dots \times R$. We can also imagine that f has the form $f = \sum f_{\theta,v}$, where all the tubes $T_{\theta,v}$ are contained in W .

We study this case using induction on the dimension. In the tangential algebraic case, the behavior of Ef on the hyperplane Z can be controlled by applying Theorem 1.5 in dimension $n-1$. Here is one way to set this up. There is a standard L^2 estimate giving

$$(2.8) \quad \|Ef\|_{L^2(B_R)} \lesssim R^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

It is not hard to reduce Theorem 1.5 to the case that $\|Ef\|_{L^2(B_R)} \sim R^{1/2}\|f\|_{L^2}$, and so we can think of Theorem 1.5 in the equivalent form

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \lesssim R^{-1/2+\epsilon} \|Ef\|_{L^2(B_R)}.$$

We can apply Theorem 1.5 in dimension $n-1$ to study Ef on Z , and we get the estimate

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^{\bar{p}(k,n-1)}(Z \cap B_R)} \lesssim R^{-1/2+\epsilon} \|Ef\|_{L^2(Z \cap B_R)}.$$

Now $\bar{p}(k, n-1) > \bar{p}(k, n) = p$. Interpolating between this estimate and the L^2 estimate (2.8), we get a bound of the form

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(Z \cap B_R)} \lesssim R^{-1/2+e+\epsilon} \|Ef\|_{L^2(Z \cap B_R)},$$

for $p = \bar{p}(k, n)$, where e is an exponent depending on k, n . The same estimate holds not just for Z but for any translate of Z in the slab W . These estimates control the behavior of Ef in the directions tangent to Z .

To get a good estimate in the tangential algebraic case, we also have to control the behavior of Ef in the direction transverse to Z . We will show that there is a direction transverse to the hyperplane Z so that $|Ef(x)|$ is morally constant as we move x in this direction for distance $\lesssim R^{1/2}$. We call this behavior a transverse equidistribution estimate. It implies that

$$\|Ef\|_{L^2(B_R)}^2 \sim \|Ef\|_{L^2(W)}^2 \sim R^{1/2} \|Ef\|_{L^2(Z \cap B_R)}^2, \text{ and}$$

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \sim \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(W)}^p \sim R^{1/2} \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(Z \cap B_R)}^p.$$

Using these estimates, we can control $\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}$ by induction on the dimension:

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p &\sim \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(W)}^p \sim R^{1/2} \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(Z \cap B_R)}^p \\ &\lesssim R^{1/2} R^{(-1/2+e+\epsilon)p} \|Ef\|_{L^2(Z \cap B_R)}^p \sim R^{1/2} R^{(-1/2+e+\epsilon)p} \left(R^{-1/2} \|Ef\|_{L^2(B_R)}^2 \right)^{p/2}. \end{aligned}$$

There are a lot of messy powers of R in this computation. But plugging in $p = \bar{p}(k, n)$ and working out the exponent, one gets $\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \lesssim R^{-1/2+\epsilon} \|Ef\|_{L^2(B_R)} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2}$, which closes the induction in the tangential algebraic case. The exponent $p = \bar{p}(k, n) = 2 \cdot \frac{n+k}{n+k-2}$ is exactly the exponent needed to make the powers of R work out in this computation.

Next we sketch the reason for this transverse equidistribution. From the definition of E , we see that $Ef_{\theta,v}$ has Fourier transform supported in a ball of radius $R^{-1/2}$ around

$$\xi(\theta) = (\omega_{\theta,1}, \dots, \omega_{\theta,n-1}, |\omega_\theta|^2),$$

where ω_θ denotes the center of θ . We know that all the wave packets $Ef_{\theta,v}$ in Ef are supported in tubes $T_{\theta,v} \subset W$. This situation restricts the directions $G(\theta)$, which in turn restricts the frequencies $\xi(\theta)$, which leads to the transverse equidistribution estimate. The connection between $G(\theta)$ and $\xi(\theta)$ is simplest for a slightly different operator - the extension operator for the sphere. In that case, $G(\theta) = \xi(\theta)$. Since the tubes $T_{\theta,v}$ all lie in W , the directions $G(\theta)$ all lie in the $R^{-1/2}$ -neighborhood of the subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ parallel to Z . Therefore, the frequencies $\xi(\theta)$ all lie in the $R^{-1/2}$ -neighborhood of V also. So the Fourier transform of Ef is supported in the $R^{-1/2}$ -neighborhood of V . If ℓ denotes a line perpendicular to V (or to Z), then the restriction of Ef to ℓ

has Fourier transform supported in a ball of radius $R^{-1/2}$. Therefore, $|Ef|$ is morally constant as we move along the line ℓ for distances $\lesssim R^{-1/2}$.

For the extension operator for the paraboloid, the situation is similar but a touch messier. We know that the directions $G(\theta)$ all lie in the $R^{-1/2}$ -neighborhood of the plane V . A short calculation shows that the frequencies $\xi(\theta)$ all lie in the $R^{-1/2}$ -neighborhood of an affine hyperplane V' . The hyperplane V' is not equal to V , but the angle between V and V' is fairly small. If ℓ is perpendicular to the plane V' , then it still follows that $|Ef|$ is morally constant as we move along ℓ for distances $\lesssim R^{-1/2}$. The line ℓ is no longer exactly perpendicular to the original plane Z , but it is still quantitatively transverse to Z , and this is good enough for our application.

In this sketch, we assumed that Z is a hyperplane. But in the real proof we cannot assume this. We have to set up the induction on dimension in a different way, taking into account the possibility that Z is curved. We explain this in the next subsection.

Finally, it can happen that the transverse wave packets dominate. In this last case, $\mu_{Ef}(W)$ dominates $\mu_{Ef}(B_R)$, but the wave packets transverse to W make the main contribution to $\mu_{Ef}(W)$. In this case, we can imagine that $f = \sum f_{\theta,v}$ where each tube $T_{\theta,v}$ is transverse to W . Recall that the number of times a line can cross the hypersurface Z is $\leq D \lesssim 1$. Similarly, we will prove that the number of times a tube $T_{\theta,v}$ can cross the surface W is $\lesssim 1$. (This is trivial in the special case that Z is a hyperplane, but we will prove that it holds in general.)

In this case, we subdivide the ball B_R into smaller balls B_j with radius $\rho \ll R$. A tube $T_{\theta,v}$ enters $\sim (R/\rho) \gg 1$ of these balls. But because of the discussion above, a tube $T_{\theta,v}$ can cross W transversely in $\lesssim 1$ balls B_j . We define

$$\mathbb{T}_{j,trans} := \{(\theta, v) | T_{\theta,v} \text{ crosses } W \text{ transversely in } B_j\},$$

$$f_{j,trans} := \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_{j,trans}} f_{\theta,v}.$$

Since a tube $T_{\theta,v}$ can cross W transversely in $\lesssim 1$ balls B_j , each (θ, v) belongs to $\lesssim 1$ sets $\mathbb{T}_{j,trans}$. Therefore,

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_j \|f_{j,trans}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Since we assumed that all the wave packets in f intersect W transversely, $Ef_{j,trans}$ is essentially equal to Ef on $W \cap B_j$. Therefore,

$$\mu_{Ef}(W \cap B_j) \leq \mu_{Ef_{j,trans}}(B_j).$$

Since we are in the algebraic case, and since we assumed that all the tubes $T_{\theta,v}$ intersect W transversely, we have

$$(2.10) \quad \mu_{Ef}(B_R) \lesssim \mu_{Ef}(W) \sim \sum_j \mu_{Ef}(W \cap B_j) \lesssim \sum_j \mu_{Ef_{j,trans}}(B_j).$$

By induction on the radius, we can assume that

$$\mu_{Ef_j}(B_j) \leq [C(\epsilon)\rho^\epsilon]^p \|f_{j,trans}\|_{L^2}^p.$$

Plugging this bound into (2.10) and then applying (2.9), we get

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim [C(\epsilon)\rho^\epsilon]^p \sum_j \|f_{j,\text{trans}}\|_{L^2}^p.$$

Since $p > 2$, we get $\sum_j \|f_{j,\text{trans}}\|_{L^2}^p \leq (\sum_j \|f_{j,\text{trans}}\|_{L^2}^2)^{p/2} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}^p$. Therefore, we have

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim [C(\epsilon)\rho^\epsilon]^p \|f\|_{L^2}^p.$$

Since (R/ρ) is large, $C\rho^\epsilon < R^\epsilon$, and so this closes the induction in the transverse algebraic case.

2.1. Studying wave packets tangent to a variety. In the preceding sketch, we considered the special case that the variety Z is a hyperplane. In this special situation, the tangential algebraic case reduces to the original theorem in dimension $n-1$. In the full proof we need to consider curved varieties Z , and so we have to do the induction on the dimension in a different way.

If Z is an m -dimensional variety in $\mathbb{R}^n$, then we say that the tube $T_{\theta,v}$ is α -tangent to Z in B_R if the following two conditions hold:

- Distance condition:

$$T_{\theta,v} \subset N_{\alpha R}(Z) \cap B_R.$$

- Angle condition: If $z \in Z \cap N_{\alpha R}(T_{\theta,v})$, then

$$\text{Angle}(T_z Z, G(\theta)) \leq \alpha.$$

For each dimension m , we will choose an angle α_m slightly larger than $R^{-1/2}$, and then we define

$$\mathbb{T}_Z := \{(\theta, v) : T_{\theta,v} \text{ is } \alpha_m\text{-tangent to } Z \text{ in } B_R\}.$$

Our main technical result is Proposition 8.1. It says that if Z is an m -dimensional variety of controlled degree, and if $f = \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_Z} f_{\theta,v}$, then (for a range of exponents $p \geq 2$),

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \leq M \|f\|_{L^2},$$

where M is a fairly complicated expression which depends on the parameters of the setup, including the exponent p , the radius R , the dimension m , the value of A , etc.

The proof of Proposition 8.1 is by induction on the dimension m . The base of the induction is the case $m = k-1$. In this case, $\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}$ is negligibly small. To see this, consider a small ball B_{K^2} . The function Ef is essentially supported in $N_{R^{1/2}}(Z) \cap B_R$, so we can assume $B_{K^2} \subset N_{R^{1/2}}(Z) \cap B_R$. Because of the angle condition, all the wave packets $T_{\theta,v} \in \mathbb{T}_Z$ that pass through B_{K^2} have direction $G(\theta)$ within a small angle of an $(k-1)$ -plane – the plane $T_z Z$ for a point $z \in Z$ near to B_{K^2} . But now, by the first key point about the definition of $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$, the ball B_{K^2} makes a negligible contribution to $\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p}$. This provides the base of the induction.

The proof of Proposition 8.1 follows the rough outline of our first sketch. We again use polynomial partitioning. Under the hypotheses of the proposition, we know that Ef is essentially supported in $N_{R^{1/2}}(Z)$ for a given m -dimensional variety Z . We want to find a polynomial P so that $Z(P)$ cuts $N_{R^{1/2}}(Z)$ into smaller cells. To do this, we choose new orthogonal coordinates $y_1, \dots, y_n$ so that the projection of Z to the $(y_1, \dots, y_m)$ -plane is non-degenerate on a significant portion of Z . Then we let P be a polynomial in $y_1, \dots, y_m$. In this case, $Z(P)$ intersects Z transversely (at least on a significant portion of Z), and this makes the polynomial partitioning work. Essentially everything works as in the first sketch, except that because P depends on only m variables, the number of cells O_i is only $\sim D^m$. This will affect the final exponents, but the method of the argument is the same. If μ_{Ef} is

concentrated on the cells O'_i , then we can prove the desired bounds by induction. Otherwise, μ_{Ef} is concentrated in the $R^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of a lower-dimensional variety $Y = Z \cap Z(P)$.

Now we turn to this algebraic case. In the algebraic case, there is a lower-dimensional variety Y , with $\text{Deg } Y \lesssim \text{Deg } Z$, so that

$$\mu_{Ef}(N_{R^{1/2}}(Y) \cap B_R) \gtrsim \mu_{Ef}(B_R) \sim \mu_{Ef}(N_{R^{1/2}}(Z) \cap B_R).$$

There are two types of wave packets that contribute to μ_{Ef} on $N_{R^{1/2}}(Y) \cap B_R$: tangential wave packets, which lie in $N_{R^{1/2}}(Y)$ and run tangent to Y , and transverse wave packets, which cut across $N_{R^{1/2}}(Y)$. (Recall that all the wave packets are tangent to Z by hypothesis.)

In our current setup, if all the wave packets are tangent to Y , then we get the desired estimate just by induction on the dimension m .

However, there may be a mix of transverse and tangential wave packets. If we let f_{tang} be the sum of the tangential wave packets and f_{trans} be the sum of the transverse wave packets, then the quasi-triangle inequality for $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$ (1.12) gives

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \lesssim \|Ef_{tang}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_R)} + \|Ef_{trans}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_R)}.$$

This is the step in the proof where we need to use the quasi-triangle inequality.

We can handle the tangential terms by induction on the dimension, and now we turn to the transverse terms. As in the last sketch, we decompose $B_R = \cup_j B_j$, where each ball B_j has radius $\rho \ll R$. We define $f_{j,trans}$ as above to be the sum of wave packets that intersect $N_{R^{1/2}}(Y)$ transversely in B_j . As in the previous sketch, geometric arguments show that a tube $T_{\theta,v}$ can intersect $N_{R^{1/2}}(Y)$ transversely in $\lesssim 1$ balls B_j , and so

$$\sum_j \|f_{j,trans}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Next we want to study $\|Ef_{j,trans}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}$ by using induction on the radius. This step is more complicated than in the previous sketch. We know that f is concentrated on wave packets that are tangent to Z on B_R , and we need to use that information. We expand $Ef_{j,trans}$ into wave packets on the ball B_j . Since B_j has radius ρ , each wave packet is essentially supported on a tube of radius $\rho^{1/2}$ and length ρ in B_j . When we examine this wave packet decomposition, it is not exactly true that all the wave packets are tangent to Z in B_j – in fact, something better is true. The wave packets of $f_{j,trans}$ on B_j all lie in $N_{R^{1/2}}(Z) \cap B_j$, but they don't necessarily lie in $N_{\rho^{1/2}}(Z) \cap B_j$. We cover $N_{R^{1/2}}(Z) \cap B_j$ with disjoint translates of $N_{\rho^{1/2}}(Z) \cap B_j$:

$$N_{R^{1/2}}(Z) \cap B_j = \cup_b N_{\rho^{1/2}}(Z+b) \cap B_j.$$

Now it turns out that each wave packet of $f_{j,trans}$ lies in one of these translates. We let $f_{j,trans,b}$ be the sum of the wave packets that lie in $N_{\rho^{1/2}}(Z+b) \cap B_j$. Now we have $f_{j,trans} = \sum_b f_{j,trans,b}$, and

$$\|Ef_{j,trans}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}^p \sim \sum_b \|Ef_{j,trans,b}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(N_{\rho^{1/2}}(Z+b) \cap B_j)}^p \sim \sum_b \|Ef_{j,trans,b}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}^p.$$

The wave packets of $Ef_{j,trans,b}$ are tangent to the m -dimensional variety $Z+b$ on B_j . Therefore, we can study $\|Ef_{j,trans,b}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}$ by induction on the radius: we can assume that

$$\|Ef_{j,trans,b}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)} \leq M(\rho, A/2) \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}.$$

(Here we write $M(\rho, A/2)$ because M depends on the radius (which is ρ) and because we have $A/2$ in place of A .) Putting together what we have learned so far in the transverse algebraic case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p &\lesssim \sum_j \|Ef_{j,trans}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}^p \\ &\sim \sum_{j,b} \|Ef_{j,trans,b}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}^p \leq M(\rho, A/2)^p \sum_{j,b} \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}^p. \end{aligned}$$

To get our final bound, it remains to control $\sum_{j,b} \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}^p$. Since each wave packet of $f_{j,trans}$ lies in exactly one $f_{j,trans,b}$, it is easy to check that $\|f_{j,trans}\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_b \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}^2$. We also already know that $\sum_j \|f_{j,trans}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}^2$. And so we see that

$$\sum_{j,b} \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}^p \lesssim \left(\max_{j,b} \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}^{p-2} \right) \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The last ingredient of the proof is an estimate for $\max_{j,b} \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}$, which has to do with transverse equidistribution. Recall that since f is concentrated on wave packets in $\mathbb{T}_Z$, Ef is equidistributed in directions transverse to Z . Recall that $N_{R^{1/2}}(Z) \cap B_j$ is covered by thinner neighborhoods $N_{\rho^{1/2}}(Z+b) \cap B_j$. The number of these thinner neighborhoods is $\sim \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{n-m}$. Because of transverse equidistribution, each of these neighborhoods receives an even share of the L^2 norm of $Ef_{j,trans}$. In other words, for each b ,

$$\|Ef_{j,trans}\|_{L^2(N_{\rho^{1/2}}(Z+b) \cap B_j)}^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \|Ef_{j,trans}\|_{L^2(N_{R^{1/2}}(Z) \cap B_j)}^2.$$

Using this inequality, we prove the desired estimate for $\|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}$:

$$(2.11) \quad \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \|f_{j,trans}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

2.2. Outline of the paper. We carry out the proof of Theorem 1.5 over Sections 3 - 8 of the paper. Section 3 reviews some standard facts about wave packets. Section 4 proves some basic properties of the broad “norms” $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$. Section 5 contains tools from algebraic geometry (and differential geometry) that we will use to study the geometry of the algebraic varieties that appear in the proofs. Section 6 proves the first transverse equidistribution estimate. For any ball $B(y, \rho) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, there is a wave packet decomposition for Ef on the ball $B(y, \rho)$. Section 7 is about the relationship between the original wave packet decomposition on the ball B_R and the wave packet decomposition adapted to a smaller ball $B(y, \rho) \subset B_R$. This lets us state and prove a second version of the transverse equidistribution estimate, corresponding to (2.11) above. With the background and tools from these sections, we prove Theorem 1.5 in Section 8.

Following [BG], Section 9 explains how k -broad estimates imply regular L^p estimates of the form $\|Ef\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p}$. This argument finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1. Section 10 is an appendix which helps to keep track of the parameters. Unfortunately, there are quite a few parameters in

the paper – various δ 's, R , K , A , etc. The appendix lists all the parameters and how they relate to each other. Section 11 discusses further directions and open problems.

3. BASIC SETUP WITH WAVE PACKETS

Let f be a function on B^{n-1} . We first break up f into pieces $f_{\theta,v}$ that are localized in both position and frequency.

Cover B^{n-1} by finitely overlapping balls θ of radius $R^{-1/2}$. Let ψ_θ be a smooth partition of unity adapted to this cover, and write $f = \sum_\theta \psi_\theta f$.

Next we break up $\psi_\theta f$ according to frequency. Cover $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ by finitely overlapping balls of radius $\sim R^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}}$, centered at vectors $v \in R^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}} \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$. Let η_v be a smooth partition of unity adapted to this cover. We can now write

$$f = \sum_{\theta,v} (\eta_v(\psi_\theta f))^\vee = \sum_{\theta,v} \eta_v^\vee * (\psi_\theta f).$$

Note that $\eta_v^\vee(x)$ is rapidly decaying for $|x| \gtrsim R^{\frac{1-\delta}{2}}$. Choose smooth functions $\tilde{\psi}_\theta$ so that $\tilde{\psi}_\theta$ is supported on θ , but $\tilde{\psi}_\theta$ is 1 on a small neighborhood of the support of ψ_θ . A bit more precisely, we would like $\tilde{\psi}_\theta = 1$ on a $cR^{-1/2}$ neighborhood of the support of ψ_θ for a small constant $c > 0$. Now we define

$$f_{\theta,v} := \tilde{\psi}_\theta [\eta_v^\vee * (\psi_\theta f)].$$

Because of the rapid decay of $\eta_v^\vee$,

$$\|f_{\theta,v} - \eta_v^\vee * (\psi_\theta f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Therefore, we see that

$$f = \sum_{\theta,v} f_{\theta,v} + \text{Err}, \text{ where } \|\text{Err}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Terms of the form $\text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^2}$ are negligibly small in terms of all of our estimates. These rapidly decaying errors will occur from time to time during our arguments.

The functions $f_{\theta,v}$ are approximately orthogonal. For any set $\mathbb{T}$ of pairs (θ, v) , we have

$$(3.1) \quad \left\| \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}} f_{\theta,v} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}} \|f_{\theta,v}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The decomposition $f = \sum_{\theta,v} f_{\theta,v}$ is useful in this problem because $Ef_{\theta,v}$ is localized in space. For each (θ, v) , there is a corresponding tube $T_{\theta,v}$, where $Ef_{\theta,v}$ is essentially supported. Let ω_θ denote the center of θ . We define $T_{\theta,v}$ by

$$(3.2) \quad T_{\theta,v} := \{(x', x_n) \in B_R \text{ so that } |x' + 2x_n\omega_\theta + v| \leq R^{1/2+\delta}\}.$$

Lemma 3.1. *If $x \in B_R \setminus T_{\theta,v}$, then*

$$|Ef_{\theta,v}(x)| \leq \text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

We sketch the proof by stationary phase. We note that $(e^{-iv\omega} f_{\theta,v})$ has Fourier transform essentially supported in $B_{R^{1/2+\delta/2}}$. Therefore, we have

$$\max_{\theta} |e^{-iv\omega} f_{\theta,v}| \lesssim R^{(n-1)\frac{\delta}{2}} \text{Avg}_{\theta} |e^{-iv\omega} f_{\theta,v}|.$$

Moreover, taking derivatives, we see that

$$\max_{\theta} |\partial_{\omega}^k (e^{-iv\omega} f_{\theta,v})| \lesssim \left(R^{1/2+\delta/2}\right)^k R^{(n-1)\frac{\delta}{2}} \text{Avg}_{\theta} |e^{-iv\omega} f_{\theta,v}|.$$

Let η_{θ} be a smooth bump which is equal to 1 on θ . Since θ has diameter $R^{-1/2}$, we can estimate the derivatives $|\partial^k \eta_{\theta}| \lesssim R^{k/2}$. Now we write $Ef_{\theta,v}(x)$ as

$$(3.3) \quad Ef_{\theta,v}(x) = \int \left[\eta_{\theta} e^{i(x'\omega + x_n|\omega|^2 + v\omega)} \right] \cdot (e^{-iv\omega} f_{\theta,v}).$$

We let $\Psi(\omega) := x'\omega + x_n|\omega|^2 - v\omega$. We note that

$$\partial_{\omega} \Psi = x' + 2x_n\omega + v.$$

If $x \in B_R \setminus T_{\theta,v}$, then $|x' + 2x_n\omega_{\theta} + v| = |\partial_{\omega} \Psi(\omega_{\theta})| > R^{1/2+\delta}$. We know that $|x_n| \leq R$, and so for any $\omega \in \theta$, $|2x_n\omega - 2x_n\omega_{\theta}| \lesssim R^{1/2}$. Therefore, for any $\omega \in \theta$,

$$|\partial_{\omega} \Psi(\omega)| \gtrsim R^{1/2+\delta}.$$

By applying integration by parts to (3.3) many times, we see that $|Ef_{\theta,v}(x)| \leq \text{RapDec}(R) \|f_{\theta,v}\|_{L^2}$ as desired.

The tube $T_{\theta,v}$ is a cylinder of length R and radius $\sim R^{1/2+\delta}$. It points in the direction $G(\omega_{\theta})$, where $G(\omega)$ is the unit vector given by

$$G(\omega) = \frac{(-2\omega_1, \dots, -2\omega_{n-1}, 1)}{|(-2\omega_1, \dots, -2\omega_{n-1}, 1)|}.$$

For each $\omega \in B^{n-1}$, we also define a frequency $\xi(\omega)$. Based on the formula for Ef , the frequency $\xi(\omega)$ is given by

$$\xi(\omega) := (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{n-1}, |\omega|^2).$$

We let $\xi(\theta)$ denote the image of θ under ξ :

$$\xi(\theta) := \{(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{n-1}, |\omega|^2) | \omega \in \theta\}.$$

In a distributional sense, the Fourier transform of $Ef_{\theta,v}$ is supported in $\xi(\theta)$. Also, if η_R denotes a smooth bump on B_R (of height 1), then the Fourier transform of $\eta_R Ef_{\theta,v}$ is essentially supported in $N_{R^{-1}}(\xi(\theta))$.

We introduce a little notation. If $\mathbb{T}_{\alpha}$ is any set of pairs (θ, v) , then we say that f is concentrated on wave packets from $\mathbb{T}_{\alpha}$ if

$$f = \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_{\alpha}} f_{\theta,v} + \text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Also, for any f , and for any set $\mathbb{T}_{\alpha}$, we define

$$f_\alpha = \sum_{(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_\alpha} f_{\theta, v}.$$

3.1. Orthogonality. For any fixed x_n , Ef restricted to $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{x_n\}$ can be described as an inverse Fourier transform:

$$Ef(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n) = \left(e^{ix_n |\omega|^2} f(\omega) \right)^\vee (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}).$$

Applying Plancherel, we get

$$(3.4) \quad \|Ef\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{x_n\})} = \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

We record a couple of simple corollaries of this statement.

Lemma 3.2.

$$\|Ef\|_{L^2(B_R)} \lesssim R^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof.

$$\int_{B_R} |Ef|^2 \leq \int_{-R}^R \left(\int_{B^{n-1}(R)} |Ef|^2 dx' \right) dx_n \leq 2R \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

□

Lemma 3.3. Suppose that f is concentrated on a set of wave packets $\mathbb{T}$ and that for every $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}$, $T_{\theta, v} \cap (\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{x_n\}) \subset B^{n-1}(z_0, r) \times \{x_n\}$. Then

$$(3.5) \quad \|Ef\|_{L^2(B^{n-1}(z_0, r) \times \{x_n\})} = \|f\|_{L^2} + \text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Lemma 3.4. Suppose that f is concentrated on a set of wave packets $\mathbb{T}$ and that for every $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}$, $T_{\theta, v} \cap B(z, r) \neq \emptyset$, for some radius $r \geq R^{1/2+\delta}$. Then

$$(3.6) \quad \|Ef\|_{L^2(B(z, 10r))}^2 \sim r \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Proof. For each x_n in the range $z_n - r \leq x_n \leq z_n + r$, and for each $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}$, the intersection $T_{\theta, v} \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{x_n\}$ is contained in $B(z, 5r)$. By the last lemma, we see that

$$\|Ef\|_{L^2(B(z, 5r) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{x_n\})} = \|f\|_{L^2} + \text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Applying Fubini, we get the desired bound. □

4. PROPERTIES OF THE BROAD “NORMS” $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$

We recall the definition of the k -broad “norm” $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$. Although $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$ is not literally a norm, it obeys a version of the triangle inequality and a version of Holder’s inequality. These nice algebraic features helped to motivate this particular definition.

Let B^{n-1} be a disjoint union of (approximate) balls τ of radius K^{-1} . For each τ , we define $G(\tau)$ to be the image of τ under the direction map G . If ω_τ is the center of τ , then $G(\tau)$ is essentially a ball of radius K^{-1} around $G(\omega_\tau)$ in S^{n-1} . If $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a subspace, then we write $\text{Angle}(G(\tau), V)$ for the smallest angle between any non-zero vectors $v \in V$ and $v' \in G(\tau)$.

For any ball B_{K^2} of radius K^2 in B_R , we define μ_{Ef} as in (1.9).

$$\mu_{Ef}(B_{K^2}) := \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \left(\max_{\substack{(k-1)\text{-subspaces of } \mathbb{R}^n \\ \tau: \text{Angle}(G(\tau), V_a) > K^{-1} \text{ for all } a}} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^p \right).$$

Because this expression is a little long, we abbreviate it as

$$\mu_{Ef}(B_{K^2}) := \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \left(\max_{\tau \notin V_a} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^p \right).$$

We remark that it is convenient to allow $A = 0$. If $A = 0$, then we have simply $\mu_{Ef}(B_{K^2}) = \max_\tau \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^p$.

If $U \subset B_R$ is a finite union of balls B_{K^2} , then we define $\|Ef\|_{L^p(U)}$ by:

$$(4.1) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(U)}^p := \sum_{B_{K^2} \subset U} \mu_{Ef}(B_{K^2}).$$

The k -broad “norm” obeys a weak version of the triangle inequality.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that $f = g + h$ and suppose that $A = A_1 + A_2$, where A, A_i are non-negative integers. Then*

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(U)} \lesssim \|Eg\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A_1}^p(U)} + \|Eh\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A_2}^p(U)}.$$

Proof. We expand

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(U)}^p = \sum_{B_{K^2} \subset U} \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \left(\max_{\tau \notin V_a} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^p \right).$$

Now for each ball $B_{K^2} \subset U$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \left(\max_{\tau \notin V_a} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^p \right) &\lesssim \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \left(\max_{\tau \notin V_a} \left[\int_{B_{K^2}} |Eg_\tau|^p + \int_{B_{K^2}} |Eh_\tau|^p \right] \right) \\ &\leq \min_{V_1, \dots, V_{A_1}} \left(\max_{\tau \notin V_a, 1 \leq a \leq A_1} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Eg_\tau|^p \right) + \min_{V_{A_1+1}, \dots, V_A} \left(\max_{\tau \notin V_a, A_1+1 \leq a \leq A} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Eh_\tau|^p \right). \end{aligned}$$

Summing over all $B_{K^2} \subset U$, we get

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(U)}^p \lesssim \|Eg\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A_1}^p(U)}^p + \|Eh\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A_2}^p(U)}^p.$$

□

The reason that we need a large value of A in Theorem 1.5 is that we will need to use this triangle inequality many times. If $A = 1$, $\text{BL}_{k,1}^p$ does not obey a good triangle inequality. But if we start with A a large constant, we can use Lemma 4.1 many times. In effect, $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$ behaves like a norm as long as we only use the triangle inequality $O_\epsilon(1)$ times in our argument, and as long as we choose $A = A(\epsilon)$ large enough.

$\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$ also obeys a version of (a corollary of) Holder’s inequality.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that $1 \leq p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$ and $0 \leq \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \leq 1$ obey $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1$ and*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \alpha_1 \frac{1}{p_1} + \alpha_2 \frac{1}{p_2}.$$

Also suppose that $A = A_1 + A_2$. Then

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(U)} \leq \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A_1}^{p_1}(U)}^{\alpha_1} \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A_2}^{p_2}(U)}^{\alpha_2}.$$

Proof. The left-hand side is

$$\left[\sum_{B_{K^2} \subset U} \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \max_{\tau \notin V_a} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Applying the regular Holder inequality to the inner integral, this expression is

$$\leq \left[\sum_{B_{K^2} \subset U} \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \max_{\tau \notin V_a} \left(\int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^{p_1} \right)^{\alpha_1 \frac{p}{p_1}} \left(\int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^{p_2} \right)^{\alpha_2 \frac{p}{p_2}} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

We can bring the maximum over τ inside, so the last expression is

$$\leq \left[\sum_{B_{K^2} \subset U} \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \left(\max_{\tau \notin V_a} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^{p_1} \right)^{\alpha_1 \frac{p}{p_1}} \left(\max_{\tau \notin V_a} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^{p_2} \right)^{\alpha_2 \frac{p}{p_2}} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Now we cannot bring the minimum inside the parentheses. But we can split $V_1, \dots, V_A$ into $V_1, \dots, V_{A_1}$ and $V_{A_1+1}, \dots, V_A$. If we weaken the first condition $\tau \notin V_1 \dots V_A$ to $\tau \notin V_1, \dots, V_{A_1}$, and if we weaken the second condition $\tau \notin V_1, \dots, V_A$ to $\tau \notin V_{A_1+1}, \dots, V_A$, then we see that the last expression is bounded by

$$\leq \left[\sum_{B_{K^2} \subset U} \left(\min_{V_1, \dots, V_{A_1}} \max_{\tau \notin V_a, 1 \leq a \leq A_1} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^{p_1} \right)^{\alpha_1 \frac{p}{p_1}} \left(\min_{V_{A_1+1}, \dots, V_A} \max_{\tau \notin V_a, A_1+1 \leq a \leq A} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^{p_2} \right)^{\alpha_2 \frac{p}{p_2}} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Now we apply Holder to the initial sum over $B_{K^2} \subset U$, and we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left[\sum_{B_{K^2} \subset U} \min_{V_1, \dots, V_{A_1}} \max_{\tau \notin V_a, 1 \leq a \leq A_1} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^{p_1} \right]^{\frac{\alpha_1}{p_1}} \left[\sum_{B_{K^2} \subset U} \min_{V_{A_1+1}, \dots, V_A} \max_{\tau \notin V_a, A_1+1 \leq a \leq A} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^{p_2} \right]^{\frac{\alpha_2}{p_2}} \\ &= \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A_1}^{p_1}(U)}^{\alpha_1} \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A_2}^{p_2}(U)}^{\alpha_2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

5. TOOLS FROM ALGEBRAIC GEOMETRY

5.1. Transverse complete intersections. Over the course of our argument we will work not just with algebraic hypersurfaces but algebraic varieties of all dimensions. We write $Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m})$ for the set of common zeroes of the polynomials $P_1, \dots, P_{n-m}$. Throughout the paper, we will work with a nice class of varieties called transverse complete intersections. The variety $Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m})$ is a transverse complete intersection if

$$(5.1) \quad \nabla P_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla P_{n-m}(x) \neq 0 \text{ for all } x \in Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m}).$$

By the implicit function theorem, a transverse complete intersection $Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m})$ is a smooth m -dimensional manifold. Because of Sard's theorem, there are lots of transverse complete intersections. Here is a lemma making this precise.

Lemma 5.1. *If P is a polynomial on $\mathbb{R}^n$, then for almost every $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $Z(P + c_0)$ is a transverse complete intersection.*

More generally, suppose that $Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m})$ is a transverse complete intersection and that P is another polynomial. Then for almost every $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m}, P + c_0)$ is a transverse complete intersection.

Proof. We begin with the first case. We know that $P : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function, and so by Sard's theorem, almost every $y \in \mathbb{R}$ is a regular value for P . But if $-c_0$ is a regular value for P , then $\nabla P(x) \neq 0$ whenever $P(x) + c_0 = 0$.

The general case is similar. We know that $Z = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m})$ is a smooth m -dimensional manifold, and $P : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function. By Sard's theorem, almost every $y \in \mathbb{R}$ is a regular value of the map $P : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If $x \in Z$ and $P(x)$ is a regular value, then $dP_x \neq 0$, where $dP : T_x Z \rightarrow T_{P(x)} \mathbb{R}$. In terms of $\nabla P(x)$, this means that

$$\nabla P_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla P_{n-m}(x) \wedge \nabla P(x) \neq 0.$$

So if $-c_0$ is a regular value for $P : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then $Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m}, P + c_0)$ is a transverse complete intersection. $\square$

5.2. Polynomial partitioning. Polynomial partitioning is a key tool in our arguments. Our presentation here is a minor variation on the polynomial partitioning result from [GK]. We begin by stating a partitioning result from [G]:

Theorem 5.2. *(Theorem 1.4 in [G]) Suppose that $W \geq 0$ is a (non-zero) L^1 function on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then for each D there is a non-zero polynomial P of degree at most D so that $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus Z(P)$ is a union of $\sim D^n$ disjoint open sets O_i , and the integrals $\int_{O_i} W$ are all equal.*

We want to use this result, but we need to upgrade it in a minor way. Because we want all the varieties that appear in our argument to be transverse complete intersections, we need to be able to perturb P a little bit. In order to understand this issue, we need to review some of the proof of Theorem 5.2. The proof is based on the polynomial ham sandwich theorem, which is due to Stone and Tukey [StTu]. Here is a version of the theorem which is convenient for our purposes:

Theorem 5.3. *(Polynomial ham sandwich theorem, cf. Corollary 1.2 in [G]) If $W_1, \dots, W_N$ are L^1 -functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$, then there exists a non-zero polynomial P of degree $\leq C_n N^{1/n}$ so that for each W_j ,*

$$\int_{\{P>0\}} W_j = \int_{\{P<0\}} W_j.$$

Using the polynomial ham sandwich theorem iteratively, we get the following partitioning result.

Corollary 5.4. *If $W \geq 0$ is a (non-zero) L^1 -function on $\mathbb{R}^n$, then there is a sequence of polynomials $Q_1, Q_2, \dots$ with $\text{Deg } Q_j \lesssim 2^{j/n}$ with the following equidistribution property:*

If $S \geq 1$, and if $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_S \in \{-1, +1\}$ are any sign conditions, then

$$\int_{\text{Sign}(Q_s)=\sigma_s \text{ for } 1 \leq s \leq S} W = 2^{-S} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} W.$$

We can slightly perturb each Q_s by adding a small generic constant: $\tilde{Q}_s = Q_s + c_s$, where $c_s \in \mathbb{R}$. Using this small perturbation, we will be able to arrange that all the varieties that appear in our arguments are transverse complete intersections. As long as the constants c_s are sufficiently small, we still have the following slightly weaker version of the equidistribution result: if $S \geq 1$, and if $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_S \in \{-1, +1\}$ are any sign conditions, then

$$2^{-S-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} W \leq \int_{\text{Sign}(\tilde{Q}_s)=\sigma_s \text{ for } 1 \leq s \leq S} W \leq 2^{-S+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} W.$$

This gives the following polynomial partitioning result, which is designed to allow small perturbations:

Theorem 5.5. *Suppose that $W \geq 0$ is a (non-zero) L^1 function on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then for any degree D the following holds.*

There is a sequence of polynomials $Q_1, \dots, Q_S$ with the following properties. We have $\sum \text{Deg } Q_s \lesssim D$ and $2^S \sim D^n$. Let $P = \prod_{s=1}^S \tilde{Q}_s = \prod_{s=1}^S (Q_s + c_s)$ where $c_s \in \mathbb{R}$. Let O_i be the open sets given by the sign conditions of $\tilde{Q}_s$. There are $2^S \sim D^n$ cells O_i and $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus Z(P) = \cup_i O_i$.

If the constants c_s are sufficiently small, then for every O_i ,

$$\int_{O_i} W \sim D^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} W.$$

For a generic choice of the constants c_s , Lemma 5.1 guarantees that $Z(\tilde{Q}_s)$ is a transverse complete intersection for each s . This implies that $Z(P)$ is a finite union of transverse complete intersections. Similarly, if $Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m})$ is a transverse complete intersection, then for a generic choice of the constants c_s , $Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m}, \tilde{Q}_s)$ will also be a transverse complete intersection for each s .

5.3. Controlling the tangent plane of a variety. Suppose that Z is an m -dimensional transverse complete intersection. We know that Z is a smooth m -dimensional manifold. We will consider some subsets of Z where the tangent plane obeys certain conditions. We will see that these subsets are in fact subvarieties of Z , and that in generic cases, they are transverse complete intersections.

Let $Z = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m})$ be a transverse complete intersection. Let $w \in \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$. Define Z_w by

$$(5.2) \quad Z_w := \{x \in Z \mid \nabla P_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla P_{n-m}(x) \wedge w = 0\}.$$

We note that since w is an m -vector, $\nabla P_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla P_{n-m}(x) \wedge w \in \Lambda^n \mathbb{R}^n$, which we identify with $\mathbb{R}$. Let $g_w := \nabla P_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla P_{n-m}(x) \wedge w$, a polynomial with degree at most $\text{Deg } P_1 + \dots + \text{Deg } P_{n-m}$. The set Z_w is the algebraic variety $Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m}, g_w)$.

Lemma 5.6. *For almost every $w \in \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$, $Z_w = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m}, g_w)$ is a smooth complete intersection.*

The proof uses some ideas from differential topology. The book [GP] is a good reference. In particular, the proof here is closely based on the proof of the transversality theorem in Chapter 2.3 of [GP].

Proof. Define a smooth function $g : Z \times \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$g(x, w) := \nabla P_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla P_{n-m}(x) \wedge w.$$

The function g is smooth, and it has no critical points, because for any $x \in Z$, $\nabla P_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla P_{n-m}(x) \neq 0$, and the restriction of g to $\{x\} \times \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$ is a non-zero linear function with no critical points. Therefore $g^{-1}(0)$ is a smooth submanifold M in $Z \times \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$ (of codimension 1).

Consider the smooth map $\pi : M \rightarrow \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$ given by $\pi(x, w) = w$. Note that $\pi^{-1}(w) = Z_w \times \{w\}$. We will use π in order to study Z_w . We claim that Z_w is a transverse complete intersection whenever w is a regular value of π . By Sard's theorem, almost every $w \in \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$ is a regular value of π , and so this claim implies our conclusion.

To see that Z_w is a transverse complete intersection, it suffices to check that the critical points of the function $g_w : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are disjoint from Z_w . In other words, it suffices to check that for every x with $(x, w) \in M$, x is a regular point of $g_w : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If w is a regular value of π , then it means that for each x with $(x, w) \in M$, (x, w) is a regular point for π . So it suffices to check that whenever (x, w) is a regular point for π , x is a regular point for g_w .

Recall that $(x, w) \in M$ is a regular point for $\pi : M \rightarrow \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if $d\pi : T_{(x,w)}M \rightarrow \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$ is surjective. To understand this condition better, we compute the tangent space $T_{(x,w)}M$. We know that $T_{(x,w)}M \subset T_{(x,w)}(Z \times \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n) = T_x Z \times \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$, and more precisely

$$T_{(x,w)}M = \{(v, w') \in T_x Z \times \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n \mid dg_{(x,w)}(v, w') = 0\}.$$

But $dg_{(x,w)}(v, w') = (dg_w)_x(v) + \nabla P_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla P_{n-m}(x) \wedge w'$. Therefore,

$$T_{(x,w)}M = \{(v, w') \in T_x Z \times \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n \mid (dg_w)_x(v) + \nabla P_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla P_{n-m}(x) \wedge w' = 0\}.$$

If x is not a regular point of dg_w , then $(dg_w)_x = 0$, and $T_{(x,w)}M = \{(v, w') \mid \nabla P_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla P_{n-m}(x) \wedge w' = 0\}$. But in this case, the projection $d\pi : T_{(x,w)}M \rightarrow \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$ is not surjective. (The projection $d\pi$ is just $d\pi(v, w') = w'$.) So if (x, w) is a regular point of π , then x is a regular point of g_w as desired. $\square$

If $W \subset \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$ is a large finite set, then on each connected component of $Z \setminus (\cup_{w \in W} Z_w)$, the tangent plane TZ is constrained in a small region of the Grassmannian. More precisely, for any small parameter $\beta > 0$, we can choose a finite set $W \subset \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$ so that, for any two points x_1, x_2 in the same component of $Z \setminus (\cup_{w \in W} Z_w)$, $\text{Angle}(T_{x_1}Z, T_{x_2}Z) < \beta$. We can also choose W generically so that each Z_w is a transverse complete intersection of dimension $m - 1$.

5.4. Controlling transverse intersections between a tube and a variety. Suppose that T is a cylinder of radius r with central axis ℓ . Suppose that $Z^m \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a transverse complete intersection. Define $Z_{>\alpha}$ by

$$Z_{>\alpha} := \{z \in Z \mid \text{Angle}(T_z Z, \ell) > \alpha\}.$$

Lemma 5.7. *Suppose that $Z = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m})$ is a transverse complete intersection and that the polynomials P_j have degree at most D . Let T be a tube of radius r as above. Then for any $\alpha > 0$, $Z_{>\alpha} \cap T$ is contained in a union of $\lesssim D^n$ balls of radius $\lesssim r\alpha^{-1}$.*

The main tool in the proof is the following version of the Bezout theorem:

Theorem 5.8. (cf. Theorem 5.2 of [CKW] for a short proof) *Suppose that $Z = Z(Q_1, \dots, Q_n)$ is a transverse complete intersection in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then Z is finite and the cardinality of Z is at most $\prod_{j=1}^n \text{Deg } Q_j$.*

Using this Bezout theorem, we now prove Lemma 5.7.

Proof. The proof is by induction on m . When $m = 0$, Theorem 5.8 guarantees that Z consists of at most D^n points, and the conclusion follows.

Now we turn to the inductive step. Without loss of generality, we can assume that ℓ is the x_n -axis. We let T_r denote the r -neighborhood of the x_n -axis.

Next we do some scaling to reduce to a special case. By rescaling, we can reduce to the case that $r = 1$. Next, by scaling in the x_n -coordinate only, we can reduce to the case that $\alpha = 1$. So we have to show that $Z_{>1} \cap T_1$ is contained in $\lesssim D^n$ balls of radius $\lesssim 1$.

Let Z_w be defined as in the last subsection. We choose $\lesssim 1$ values of w in general position so that on each connected component of $Z \setminus \cup_w Z_w$, the tangent plane of Z varies by an angle at most $\frac{1}{100}$. Since w is generic, $Z_w = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m}, g_w)$ is a transverse complete intersection of dimension $m - 1$. Also $\text{Deg } g_w \lesssim D$. We can apply our inductive assumption to Z_w , using radius $r = 20$ and $\alpha = 1/2$. We see that $Z_{w, >1/2} \cap T_{20}$ is covered by $\lesssim D^n$ balls of radius $\lesssim 1$.

Next we claim that $Z_{>1/2} \cap Z_w \subset Z_{w, >1/2}$. If $x \in Z_{>1/2} \cap Z_w$, then

$$\inf_{v \in T_x Z} \text{Angle}(v, \ell) > 1/2.$$

But $T_x Z_w \subset T_x Z$. Therefore, $\inf_{v \in T_x Z_w} \text{Angle}(v, \ell) > 1/2$, and so $x \in Z_{w, >1/2}$ as claimed.

Since the total number of w is $\lesssim 1$,

$$\cup_w Z_{>1/2} \cap Z_w \cap T_{20} \text{ is contained in } \lesssim D^n \text{ balls } B_i \text{ of radius } \lesssim 1.$$

If $B_i = B(x_i, r_i)$ we write $10B_i$ for $B(x_i, 10r_i)$. The union $\cup_i 10B_i$ is a set of $\lesssim D^n$ balls of radius $\lesssim 1$ which covers part of $Z_{>1} \cap T_1$. We still have to cover the remaining part

$$Z_{>1} \cap T_1 \setminus \cup_i 10B_i.$$

Consider a point z in this remaining part. We can assume the radius of each B_i is at least 2, and so we know that the distance from z to $\cup_i B_i$ is at least 10. Let A be the connected component of $Z \cap B(z, 10)$ containing z . We claim that A is disjoint from all Z_w . Indeed, suppose that γ was a curve in A starting at z and intersecting $\cup_w Z_w$ for the first time at $z' \in A$. Along the curve γ , the tangent plane of TZ is constant up to angle $\frac{1}{100}$. Since γ starts at $z \in Z_{>1}$, $\gamma \subset Z_{>1/2}$. Also, $\gamma \subset B(z, 10) \subset T_{20}$. We conclude that $z' \in Z_{>1/2} \cap Z_w \cap T_{20}$, and so so $z' \in \cup_i B_i$. But $B(z, 10)$ is

disjoint from $\cup_i B_i$. This contradiction proves the claim. Since A is connected and disjoint from all Z_w , the tangent plane of Z is constant on A up to angle $\frac{1}{100}$.

Therefore, A is a small perturbation of an m -plane that cuts across T_1 in a quantitatively transverse way. Let Π be a random $(n-m)$ -plane containing the x_n -axis. With probability $\gtrsim 1$, $\Pi \cap A \cap T_1$ is non-empty. By the Bezout theorem (Theorem 5.8), $|\Pi \cap Z| \leq D^{n-m}$ for generic Π . Therefore, there can be at most $\lesssim D^{n-m}$ disjoint sets A of this type. So we see that the remaining part of $Z_{>1} \cap T_1$ is contained in $\lesssim D^{n-m}$ additional balls of radius $\lesssim 1$.

□

6. TRANSVERSE EQUIDISTRIBUTION ESTIMATES

In this section we prove a transverse equidistribution estimate. To set up the statement, we first define what it means for a wave packet to be tangent to a transverse complete intersection Z .

Definition 6.1. Suppose that $Z = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m})$ is a transverse complete intersection. We say that $T_{\theta,v}$ is $R^{-1/2+\delta_m}$ -tangent to Z in B_R if:

$$(6.1) \quad T_{\theta,v} \subset N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B_R,$$

and for any $x \in T_{\theta,v}$ and $z \in Z \cap B_R$ with $|x - z| \lesssim R^{1/2+\delta_m}$,

$$(6.2) \quad \text{Angle}(G(\theta), T_z Z) \lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}.$$

We define

$$\mathbb{T}_Z := \{(\theta, v) | T_{\theta,v} \text{ is } R^{-1/2+\delta_m} \text{ tangent to } Z \text{ in } B_R\}.$$

We say that f is concentrated in wave packets from $\mathbb{T}_Z$ if

$$\sum_{(\theta,v) \notin \mathbb{T}_Z} \|f_{\theta,v}\|_{L^2} \leq \text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

(In this definition $\delta_m > 0$ is a small constant. The estimates we prove in this section hold for any $\delta_m \geq 0$. We will choose δ_m in Section 8.)

Suppose that B is a ball of radius $R^{1/2+\delta_m}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Define

$$(6.3) \quad \mathbb{T}_{B,Z} := \{(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_Z | T_{\theta,v} \cap B \neq \emptyset\}.$$

The main result of this section is the following transverse equidistribution estimate.

Lemma 6.2. Suppose that B is a ball of radius $R^{1/2+\delta_m}$ in $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and that $\rho \leq R$. Suppose that $g = \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_{B,Z}} g_{\theta,v}$. Then

$$\int_{B \cap N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z)} |Eg|^2 \lesssim R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \int_{2B} |Eg|^2 + \text{RapDec}(R) \|g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

We build up to the proof via several smaller lemmas. We begin with a version of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, saying that a function which is concentrated in a small ball in frequency space cannot concentrate too much in physical space.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose that $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a function, and that $\hat{G}$ is supported in a ball of radius r , $B(\xi_0, r)$. Then for any ball $B(x_0, \rho)$ of radius $\rho \leq r^{-1}$,*

$$\int_{B(x_0, \rho)} |G|^2 \lesssim \frac{|B_\rho|}{|B_{r^{-1}}|} \int |G|^2.$$

Proof. Let η be a smooth bump function with $|\eta| \sim 1$ on $B(x_0, \rho)$ and rapidly decaying outside of it. Then $|\hat{\eta}(\xi)| \sim |B_\rho|$ on $B_{\rho^{-1}}$ and rapidly decaying outside of it.

$$\int_{B_\rho} |G|^2 \lesssim \int |\eta G|^2 = \int |\hat{\eta} * \hat{G}|^2.$$

For $\xi \lesssim \rho^{-1}$, we bound

$$|\hat{\eta} * \hat{G}(\xi)| \leq \|\hat{\eta}\|_{L^\infty} \|\hat{G}\|_{L^1} \sim |B_\rho| \int_{B_r} |\hat{G}|.$$

For $|\xi|$ far from $B_{\rho^{-1}}$, the rapid decay of η takes over and gives a stronger bound. All together, we have

$$\int |\hat{\eta} * \hat{G}|^2 \lesssim |B_\rho^{-1}| \left(|B_\rho| \int_{B_r} |\hat{G}| \right)^2 \leq |B_\rho| |B_r| \int |\hat{G}|^2 = \frac{|B_\rho|}{|B_{r^{-1}}|} \int |G|^2.$$

□

Next we need a more local version of this lemma.

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose that $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a function, and that $\hat{G}$ is supported in a ball of radius r , $B(\xi_0, r)$. Then for any ball $B(x_0, \rho)$ with $\rho \leq r^{-1}$, we have the inequality*

$$\int_{B(x_0, \rho)} |G|^2 \lesssim \frac{|B_\rho|}{|B_{r^{-1}}|} \int W_{B(x_0, r^{-1})} |G|^2,$$

where $W_{B(x_0, r^{-1})}$ is a weight function which is equal to 1 on $B(x_0, r^{-1})$ and rapidly decaying outside of it.

Proof. Let ψ be a function with the support of $\hat{\psi} \subset B_r$ and with $|\psi| \sim 1$ on $B(x_0, r^{-1})$ and rapidly decaying outside $B(x_0, r^{-1})$. Our weight function will be $W = |\psi|^2$.

Let $H = \psi \cdot G$. Note that $\hat{H}$ is supported in $B(\xi_0, 2r)$. Applying Lemma 6.3 to H , we see that

$$\int_{B(x_0, \rho)} |G|^2 \lesssim \int_{B(x_0, \rho)} |H|^2 \lesssim \frac{|B_\rho|}{|B_{r^{-1}}|} \int |H|^2 = \frac{|B_\rho|}{|B_{r^{-1}}|} \int W |G|^2.$$

□

Suppose that B is a ball of radius $R^{1/2+\delta_m}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and V is a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Define

$$(6.4) \quad \mathbb{T}_{B,V} := \{(\theta, v) | T_{\theta,v} \cap B \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \text{Angle}(G(\theta), V) \lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}\}.$$

Let $2B$ denote the ball with the same center as B and twice the radius.

If $g = \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_{B,V}} g_{\theta,v}$, then we will show that Eg is equidistributed in B along directions transverse to V . More precisely, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6.5. *If $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a subspace, then there is a subspace $V' \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with the following properties.*

- (1) $\dim V + \dim V' = n$.
- (2) V' is transverse to V in the sense that for any unit vectors $v \in V$ and $v' \in V'$,

$$\text{Angle}(v, v') \gtrsim 1.$$

- (3) Suppose that

$$g = \sum_{(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{B, V}} g_{\theta, v}.$$

If Π is a plane parallel to V' , and $x_0 \in \Pi \cap B$, then for any $\rho \leq R$,

$$(6.5) \quad \int_{\Pi \cap B(x_0, \rho^{1/2 + \delta_m})} |Eg|^2 \lesssim R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-\dim V'} \int_{\Pi \cap 2B} |Eg|^2 + \text{RapDec}(R) \|g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Proof. To prove the lemma, we locate the appropriate space V' and then we appeal to Lemma 6.4.

The proof is about relating the direction $G(\theta)$ and the frequency $\xi(\theta)$. Whenever an object has to do with directions, we label it with a subscript G , and whenever it has to do with frequencies, we label it with a subscript ξ . Since V is a set of directions of tubes, we write V_G for V . Consider the set of $\omega \in B^{n-1}$ so that $\text{Angle}(G(\omega), V_G) \lesssim \alpha$, for some small α . What can we say about the frequencies $\xi(\omega)$?

Recall that $G(\omega) = \frac{G_0(\omega)}{|G_0(\omega)|}$, where

$$G_0(\omega) = (-2\omega_1, \dots, -2\omega_{n-1}, 1).$$

Let $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ -plane. Examining the formula for G_0 and G , we see that for every $\omega \in B^{n-1}$, $\text{Angle}(G(\omega), \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) \geq c_{\text{angle}} > 0$.

We define

$$\text{Angle}(V_G, \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) := \max_{v \in V_G} \text{Angle}(v, \mathbb{R}^{n-1}).$$

If $\text{Angle}(V_G, \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$ is smaller than $(1/2)c_{\text{angle}}$, then $G(\omega)$ is never close to V_G for any $\omega \in B^{n-1}$. In this case $\mathbb{T}_{B, V}$ is empty and there is nothing to prove. Therefore, we can assume from now on that

$$(6.6) \quad \text{Angle}(V_G, \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) \gtrsim 1.$$

We note that $G(\omega) \in V_G$ if and only if $G_0(\omega) \in V_G$. We define $A_\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ by

$$A_\omega := \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} | G_0(\omega) \in V_G\}.$$

Since G_0 is an affine map, A_ω is an affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Since V_G is quantitatively transverse to $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, and since $G_0(\omega) = (-2\omega_1, \dots, -2\omega_{n-1}, 1)$, we see that $\dim A_\omega = \dim V - 1$. We also see that for $\omega \in B^{n-1}$,

$$\text{Dist}(\omega, A_\omega) \lesssim \text{Angle}(G(\omega), V_G).$$

Next we define A_ξ to be $A_\omega \times \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, an affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Since $\xi(\omega) = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{n-1}, |\omega|^2)$, we see that

$$\text{Dist}(\xi(\omega), A_\xi) = \text{Dist}(\omega, A_\omega).$$

The spaces A_ω and A_ξ are affine spaces. We let V_ω and V_ξ be the subspaces parallel to A_ω and A_ξ . The space $V_\xi^\perp \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is our space V' . The dimension of $V_\xi = \text{Dim } A_\omega + 1 = \text{Dim } V$, and so $\text{Dim } V' + \text{Dim } V = n$ as desired.

We let $\pi_{V'}$ be the orthogonal projection from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $V' = V_\xi^\perp$. Combining our estimates above, we see that

$$\pi_{V'}(\{\omega \in B^{n-1} \mid \text{Angle}(G(\omega), V_G) \leq \alpha\}) \subset \text{a ball of radius } \lesssim \alpha.$$

Next we want to see that V_G and $V_\xi^\perp$ are quantitatively transverse. We define

$$\text{Angle}(V_G, V_\xi^\perp) := \min_{v \in V_G, w \in v_\xi^\perp} \text{Angle}(v, w).$$

Sublemma 6.6.

$$\text{Angle}(V_G, \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) = \text{Angle}(V_G, V_\xi^\perp).$$

In particular, in the non-vacuous case that $\text{Angle}(V_G, \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) \gtrsim 1$, we see that $V = V_G$ and $V' = V_\xi^\perp$ are quantitatively transverse.

Proof. The intersection $V_G \cap G_0(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$ is an affine space parallel to V_ω . Let $v_G \in V_G$ be a unit vector perpendicular to V_ω . Let $v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}$ be an orthonormal basis of V_ω . Then $v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}, v_G$ is an orthonormal basis of V_G .

Let e_n be the n^{th} coordinate unit vector. We see that $v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}, e_n$ is an orthonormal basis for V_ξ . We also see that $V_\xi^\perp \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $V_\xi^\perp = V_\omega^\perp \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

Since $v_1, \dots, v_{m-1} \subset V_\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$,

$$\text{Angle}(V_G, \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) = \text{Angle}(v_G, \mathbb{R}^{n-1}).$$

Since v_G is perpendicular to V_ω , we see that the projection of v_G to $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ actually lies in $V_\xi^\perp$, and so

$$\text{Angle}(v_G, \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) = \text{Angle}(v_G, V_\xi^\perp).$$

But since $v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}$ are in V_ξ , we see that v_G is the vector in V_G which makes the smallest angle with $V_\xi^\perp$, and so

$$\text{Angle}(v_G, V_\xi^\perp) = \text{Angle}(V_G, V_\xi^\perp).$$

□

Let Π be an $(n-m)$ -plane parallel to V' passing through B . We know that $(Eg_{\theta,v})^\wedge$ is supported in $\xi(\theta)$. The restriction to Π of $Eg_{\theta,v}$ has Fourier transform supported in $\pi_{V'}(\xi(\theta))$. Now for all $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{B,V}$, $\text{Angle}(G(\theta), V) \lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}$, and so all $\pi_{V'}(\xi(\theta))$ lie in a single ball of radius $\lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}$. Therefore, if we view Eg as a function $G : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, its Fourier transform is supported in a ball of radius $\lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}$. We apply Lemma 6.4, giving:

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.7) \quad \int_{\Pi \cap B(x_0, \rho^{1/2+\delta_m})} |Eg|^2 &\lesssim \left(\frac{R^{1/2-\delta_m}}{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}} \right)^{-\dim V'} \int_{\Pi} W_{B(x_0, R^{1/2-\delta_m})} |Eg|^2 \\
&\lesssim R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-\dim V'} \int_{\Pi} W_B |Eg|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, $Eg = \sum_{(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{B, V}} Eg_{\theta, v}$. Each $Eg_{\theta, v}$ is essentially supported on $T_{\theta, v}$. Since $T_{\theta, v}$ is transverse to Π and intersects B , we see that if $x \in \Pi \setminus 2B$, $|Eg(x)| \leq \text{RapDec}(R) \|g\|_{L^2}$. So

$$\int_{\Pi} W_B |Eg|^2 \leq \int_{\Pi \cap 2B} |Eg|^2 + \text{RapDec}(R) \|g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

□

Now we are ready to prove Lemma 6.2.

Proof. Since $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_Z$, and $T_{\theta, v} \cap B$ is non-empty, we know that for any $z \in Z \cap 2B$,

$$\text{Angle}(T_z Z, G(\theta)) \lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}.$$

Let V be a subspace of lowest possible dimension so that, for all $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{B, Z}$,

$$\text{Angle}(V, G(\theta)) \lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}.$$

Let V' be the subspace given by Lemma 6.5. We know that $\dim V + \dim V' = n$, and we know that V' is quantitatively transverse to V . By (6.7), we also know that for any plane Π parallel to V' ,

$$(6.8) \quad \int_{\Pi \cap B(x_0, \rho^{1/2+\delta_m})} |Eg|^2 \lesssim R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-\dim V'} \int_{\Pi \cap 2B} |Eg|^2 + \text{RapDec}(R) \|g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

We claim that for each $z \in Z \cap B$, $T_z Z$ is quantitatively transverse to V' . If this is not the case, it means that there exists a point $z \in Z$ and a subspace $W \subset T_z Z$ with

$$\dim W > \dim Z - \dim V,$$

so that for each non-zero $w \in W$,

$$\text{Angle}(w, V') \leq o(1).$$

Since V and V' are transverse, this angle condition guarantees that

$$\text{Angle}(w, V) \gtrsim 1.$$

Because of this angle condition, we can construct a linear map $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow V$ so that L restricted to V is the identity, L restricted to W is zero, and $|L| \lesssim 1$. Recall that for each $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{B, Z}$, $\text{Angle}(G(\theta), V) \lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}$, and so

$$|L(G(\theta)) - G(\theta)| \lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}.$$

On the other hand, we know that $G(\theta) \subset N_{R^{-1/2+\delta_m}}(T_z Z) \cap B(1)$, and so $L(G(\theta))$ lies in

$$L(N_{R^{-1/2+\delta_m}}(T_z Z) \cap B(1)) \subset N_{CR^{-1/2+\delta_m}}(L(T_z Z)).$$

This shows that for all $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{B,Z}$,

$$\text{Angle}(G(\theta), L(T_z Z)) \lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}.$$

But since L vanishes on W , $L(T_z Z)$ is a subspace of dimension at most $\dim Z - \dim W < \dim V$. This contradicts our hypothesis that V has minimal dimension. This finishes the proof of our claim that for each $z \in Z \cap 2B$, $T_z Z$ is quantitatively transverse to V' .

Suppose that Π is a plane parallel to V' and intersecting B . Given the transversality we just proved, it follows that

$$\Pi \cap N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B \subset N_{C\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(\Pi \cap Z) \cap \Pi \cap 2B.$$

Note that $\Pi \cap Z$ is itself a transverse complete intersection of dimension $\dim V' + \dim Z - n$. Now the set, $N_{C\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(\Pi \cap Z) \cap \Pi \cap 2B$, can be covered by $R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{\dim V' + \dim Z - n}$ balls in Π of radius $\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}$ (cf. [Wo]). Applying (6.8) on each of these balls and summing, we get the bound

$$\int_{\Pi \cap N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B} |Eg|^2 \lesssim R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \int_{\Pi \cap 2B} |Eg|^2 + \text{RapDec}(R) \|g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Finally, integrating over planes Π parallel to V' (using Fubini) we get the desired bound:

$$\int_{B \cap N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z)} |Eg|^2 \lesssim R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \int_{2B} |Eg|^2 + \text{RapDec}(R) \|g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

□

7. ADJUSTING A WAVE PACKET DECOMPOSITION TO A SMALLER BALL

Suppose that $B(y, \rho) \subset B_R$ for some radius ρ in the range $R^{1/2} < \rho < R$, and we want to decompose f into wave packets associated to the ball $B(y, \rho)$. How does the new wave packet decomposition relate to the old wave packet decomposition?

If the center y is not at the origin, then we introduce new coordinates

$$\tilde{x} = x - y.$$

We define

$$\psi_y(\omega) := e^{i(y_1\omega_1 + \dots + y_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} + y_n|\omega|^2)}.$$

Then we write

$$Ef(x) = \int e^{i(x_1\omega_1 + \dots + x_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} + x_n|\omega|^2)} f(\omega) = \int e^{i(\tilde{x}_1\omega_1 + \dots + \tilde{x}_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} + \tilde{x}_n|\omega|^2)} e^{i\psi_y(\omega)} f(\omega).$$

For any function f , we use the notation

$$\tilde{f}(\omega) = e^{i\psi_y(\omega)} f(\omega).$$

In this notation, we now have

$$Ef(x) = E\tilde{f}(\tilde{x}).$$

Next we decompose $\tilde{f}$ into wave packets adapted to the ball B_ρ . We follow the construction of wave packets in Section 3, except with the radius R replaced by ρ . We cover B^{n-1} with caps $\tilde{\theta}$ of radius $\rho^{-1/2}$. We cover $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ by finitely overlapping balls of radius $\sim \rho^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}}$, centered at vectors $\tilde{v} \in \rho^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}}\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$. And we decompose $\tilde{f}$ as

$$\tilde{f} = \sum_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} \tilde{f}_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} + \text{RapDec}(R)\|f\|_{L^2},$$

where $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ is supported in $\tilde{\theta}$ and its Fourier transform is essentially supported in $B(\tilde{v}, \rho^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}})$. For each $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v})$, $E\tilde{f}_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ is essentially supported on a tube $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ of radius $\rho^{1/2+\delta}$ and length ρ . In the $\tilde{x}$ coordinates, this tube is contained in B_ρ , while in the original x coordinates, this tube is contained in $B(y, \rho)$.

How does the original wave packet decomposition $f = \sum_{\theta, v} f_{\theta, v}$ relate to the new one? The first question we study is, if we expand $f_{\theta, v}$ in wave packets at scale B_ρ , $(f_{\theta, v})^\sim = \sum_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} (f_{\theta, v})_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}^\sim$, then which $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v})$ can have a significant contribution? We answer this question in Lemma 7.1. Before stating the lemma, we need a couple definitions.

For a given y and ω we define

$$\bar{v}(\omega, y) := \partial_\omega \psi_y(\omega),$$

and we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}(\omega, y) &= \partial_\omega \psi_y(\omega) = \partial_\omega (y_1 \omega_1 + \dots + y_{n-1} \omega_{n-1} + y_n |\omega|^2) \\ &= (y_1 + 2\omega_1 y_n, \dots, y_{n-1} + 2\omega_{n-1} y_n) = y' + 2y_n \omega. \end{aligned}$$

(Here we use the notation $y' = (y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})$.) If ω_θ denotes the center of a cap θ , we also write $\bar{v}(\theta, y)$ for $\bar{v}(\omega_\theta, y)$.

Define

$$(7.1) \quad \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta, v} := \{(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) : \text{Dist}(\theta, \tilde{\theta}) \lesssim \rho^{-1/2} \text{ and } |v + \bar{v}(\theta, y) - \tilde{v}| \lesssim R^{1/2+\delta/2}\}.$$

Lemma 7.1. *The function $(f_{\theta, v})^\sim$ is concentrated in wave packets from $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta, v}$. In other words,*

$$(f_{\theta, v})^\sim = \sum_{(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta, v}} (f_{\theta, v})_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}^\sim + \text{RapDec}(R)\|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. Since $f_{\theta, v}$ is supported in θ , the support of $(f_{\theta, v})^\sim$ is clearly contained in

$$\cup \{\tilde{\theta} : \text{Dist}(\tilde{\theta}, \theta) \lesssim \rho^{-1/2}\}.$$

The main point is to check that the Fourier transform of $(f_{\theta, v})^\sim$ is essentially supported in a ball around $v + \bar{v}(\theta, y)$ of radius $\lesssim R^{1/2+\delta/2}$. Let η_θ be a bump function which is 1 on θ and decays to 0 outside of 2θ . Then

$$\left(e^{i\psi_y(\omega)} f_{\theta,v}\right)^\wedge = \left(\eta_\theta e^{i\psi_y(\omega)} \cdot f_{\theta,v}\right)^\wedge = \left(\eta_\theta e^{i\psi_y(\omega)}\right)^\wedge * (f_{\theta,v})^\wedge.$$

Now $(f_{\theta,v})^\wedge$ is rapidly decaying outside of $B(v, R^{1/2+\delta/2})$. On the other hand, a stationary phase argument shows that $(\eta_\theta e^{i\psi_y(\omega)})^\wedge$ is rapidly decaying outside of $B(\bar{v}(\theta, y), R^{1/2})$. (To see this, it helps to note that on the support of η_θ , $\partial_\omega \psi_y$ lies in a ball around $\bar{v}(\theta, y)$ of radius $\lesssim R^{1/2}$.) $\square$

Next we explore the geometric features of a tube $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ with $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta,v}$.

Lemma 7.2. *If $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta,v}$, then the tube $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ obeys the following geometric estimates:*

$$(7.2) \quad \text{HausDist}(T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}, T_{\theta,v} \cap B(y, \rho)) \lesssim R^{1/2+\delta}.$$

and

$$(7.3) \quad \text{Angle}(G(\theta), G(\tilde{\theta})) \lesssim \rho^{-1/2}.$$

Proof. We recall the definition of $T_{\theta,v}$ from (3.2):

$$T_{\theta,v} := \{(x', x_n) \in B_R \text{ so that } |x' + 2x_n\omega_\theta + v| \leq R^{1/2+\delta}\}.$$

In the coordinates $\tilde{x}$, since $x = \tilde{x} + y$ and $y' + 2y_n\omega_\theta = \bar{v}(\theta, y)$,

$$(7.4) \quad T_{\theta,v} \cap B(y, \rho) = \{(\tilde{x}', \tilde{x}_n) \in B_\rho \text{ so that } |\tilde{x}' + 2\tilde{x}_n\omega_\theta + \bar{v}(\theta, y) + v| \leq R^{1/2+\delta}\}.$$

On the other hand,

$$(7.5) \quad T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} := \{(\tilde{x}', \tilde{x}_n) \in B_\rho \text{ so that } |\tilde{x}' + 2\tilde{x}_n\omega_{\tilde{\theta}} + \tilde{v}| \leq \rho^{1/2+\delta}\}.$$

By the definition of $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta,v}$, $\text{Dist}(\tilde{\theta}, \theta) \leq \rho^{-1/2}$ and so $|\omega_\theta - \omega_{\tilde{\theta}}| \lesssim \rho^{-1/2}$. Since $|\tilde{x}_n| \leq \rho$, $|2\tilde{x}_n\omega_\theta - 2\tilde{x}_n\omega_{\tilde{\theta}}| \lesssim \rho^{1/2}$. By the definition of $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta,v}$, $|v + \bar{v}(\theta, y) - \tilde{v}| \lesssim R^{1/2+\delta/2}$. Comparing (7.4) and (7.5), we see that $\text{HausDist}(T_{\theta,v} \cap B(y, \rho), T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}) \lesssim R^{1/2+\delta}$ as desired.

Since $\text{Dist}(\tilde{\theta}, \theta) \leq \rho^{-1/2}$ it follows that $\text{Angle}(G(\theta), G(\tilde{\theta})) \lesssim \rho^{-1/2}$. $\square$

Many different (θ, v) lead to essentially the same set $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta,v}$. If $\text{Dist}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \leq \rho^{-1/2}$, and $|v_1 + \bar{v}(\theta_1, y) - v_2 - \bar{v}(\theta_2, y)| \leq R^{1/2+\delta/2}$, then $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta_1, v_1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta_2, v_2}$ are essentially the same. We can organize the possible pairs (θ, v) into equivalence classes in the following way. If $\tilde{\theta}$ is one of our caps of radius $\rho^{-1/2}$, and $w \in R^{1/2+\delta/2}\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$, then we define

$$(7.6) \quad \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\theta}, w} := \{(\theta, v) : \text{Dist}(\theta, \tilde{\theta}) \lesssim \rho^{-1/2} \text{ and } |v + \bar{v}(\theta, y) - w| \lesssim R^{1/2+\delta/2}\}.$$

If (θ_1, v_1) and (θ_2, v_2) lie in the same set $\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\theta}, w}$, then $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta_1, v_1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta_2, v_2}$ are essentially the same. They are both contained in (and essentially equal to)

$$(7.7) \quad \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\tilde{\theta}, w} := \{(\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{v}) : \text{Dist}(\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}) \lesssim \rho^{-1/2} \text{ and } |w - \tilde{v}| \lesssim R^{1/2+\delta/2}\}.$$

Now Lemma 7.1 gives the following corollary.

Lemma 7.3. *If g is concentrated in wave packets in $\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\theta},w}$, then $\tilde{g}$ is concentrated in wave packets in $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\tilde{\theta},w}$. In other words, if*

$$g = \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\theta},w}} g_{\theta,v} + \text{RapDec}(R)\|g\|_{L^2},$$

then

$$\tilde{g} = \sum_{(\tilde{\theta},\tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\tilde{\theta},w}} \tilde{g}_{\tilde{\theta},\tilde{v}} + \text{RapDec}(R)\|\tilde{g}\|_{L^2}.$$

We also note that the sets $\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ are essentially disjoint, and their union contains all the possible pairs (θ, v) . Similarly, the sets $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ are essentially disjoint and their union contains all possible pairs $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v})$. With this in mind, we define

$$(7.8) \quad g_{\tilde{\theta},w} := \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\theta},w}} g_{\theta,v}.$$

$$(7.9) \quad (\tilde{g})_{\tilde{\theta},w} := \sum_{(\tilde{\theta},\tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\tilde{\theta},w}} (\tilde{g})_{\tilde{\theta},\tilde{v}}.$$

For any g , we get a decomposition $g = \sum_{\tilde{\theta},w} g_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ obeying with

$$(7.10) \quad \|g\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_{(\tilde{\theta},w)} \|g_{\tilde{\theta},w}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

Similarly, for any $\tilde{g}$, we get a decomposition $\tilde{g} = \sum_{\tilde{\theta},w} \tilde{g}_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ with

$$(7.11) \quad \|\tilde{g}\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_{(\tilde{\theta},w)} \|\tilde{g}_{\tilde{\theta},w}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

By Lemma 7.2, for all the pairs $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\theta},w}$, the sets $T_{\theta,v} \cap B(y, \rho)$ are essentially the same. We denote this intersection by $T_{\tilde{\theta},w} \subset B(y, \rho)$. It is a tube of radius $R^{1/2+\delta}$ and length ρ . The set $\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ can be described geometrically as the set of pairs (θ, v) so that $T_{\theta,v} \cap B(y, \rho)$ is essentially $T_{\tilde{\theta},w}$, and so that the direction of $T_{\theta,v}$ obeys the inequality $\text{Angle}(G(\theta), G(\tilde{\theta})) \lesssim \rho^{-1/2}$.

We will need to study the following situation. We have a function g which is concentrated on wave packets in $\mathbb{T}_Z$, and we want to study Eg on a smaller ball $B(y, \rho) \subset B_R$. If we decompose g into wave packets associated to the ball $B(y, \rho)$, what can we say about the new wave packet decomposition?

First of all, we point out the wave decomposition of $\tilde{g}$ at scale ρ is not necessarily concentrated on wave packets that are tangent to Z on $B(y, \rho)$. By Lemma 7.1, we do know that $\tilde{g}$ is concentrated on wave packets in $\cup_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_Z} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta,v}$. If $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_Z$, then we know that $T_{\theta,v}$ is tangent to Z on B_R , which implies that

$$T_{\theta,v} \cap B(y, \rho) \subset N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B(y, \rho),$$

and that for any $x \in T_{\theta,v}$ and $z \in Z \cap B(y, \rho)$ with $|x - z| \lesssim R^{1/2+\delta_m}$,

$$\text{Angle}(G(\theta), T_z Z) \lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}.$$

If now $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta, v}$, then (7.2) and (7.3) imply that

$$T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} \subset N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B(y, \rho),$$

and that for any $x \in T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ and $z \in Z \cap B(y, \rho)$ with $|x - z| \lesssim R^{1/2+\delta_m}$,

$$\text{Angle}(G(\theta), T_z Z) \lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m} + \rho^{-1/2} \leq \rho^{-1/2+\delta_m}.$$

The angle condition is more than strong enough for $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ to be tangent to Z in $B(y, \rho)$, but it is not true that $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} \subset N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B(y, \rho)$. If $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ intersects $N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B(y, \rho)$, then the angle condition guarantees that $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ is contained in $N_{2\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B(y, \rho)$. A bit more generally, if b is a vector with $|b| \leq R^{1/2+\delta_m}$, and if $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ intersects $N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z + b) \cap B(y, \rho)$, then $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ is contained in $N_{2\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z + b) \cap B(y, \rho)$, and $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ is tangent to $Z + b$ in B_j .

For any $b \in B_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}$, we define

$$\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{Z+b} := \{(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) : T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} \text{ is tangent to } Z + b \text{ in } B_j\}.$$

$$\tilde{g}_b := \sum_{(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{Z+b}} \tilde{g}_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}.$$

So we see that if g is concentrated on wave packets in $\mathbb{T}_Z$, then $\tilde{g}$ is concentrated on wave packets in $\cup_{|b| \lesssim R^{1/2+\delta_m}} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{Z+b}$. For any $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) \in \cup_{(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_Z} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta, v}$, we saw above that either $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{Z+b}$, or else $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ is disjoint from $N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B(y, \rho)$. Therefore, for $x = y + \tilde{x} \in B(y, \rho)$,

$$(7.12) \quad |E\tilde{g}_b(\tilde{x})| \sim \chi_{N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z+b)}(x) E g(x).$$

To get finer information, it is helpful to decompose g as above as $g = \sum_{\tilde{\theta}, w} g_{\tilde{\theta}, w}$, and to think about the wave packet decomposition of each piece $(g_{\tilde{\theta}, w})^\sim$ on $B(y, \rho)$. For brevity, we let $h = g_{\tilde{\theta}, w}$. We choose a ball $B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m})$ with $x_0 \in T_{\tilde{\theta}, w} \subset B(y, \rho)$. For any $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\theta}, w}$, $T_{\theta, v} \cap B(y, \rho) \subset T_{\tilde{\theta}, w}$, and so $T_{\theta, v}$ intersects $B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m})$ in a tube segment of length $R^{1/2+\delta_m}$.

By Lemma 3.4, we have

$$(7.13) \quad \|h\|_{L^2}^2 \sim R^{-1/2-\delta_m} \|Eh\|_{L^2(B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}))}^2.$$

Now we know that $E\tilde{h}(\tilde{x}) = Eh(\tilde{x} + y)$. Also, for $x = y + \tilde{x} \in B(y, \rho)$, we know by (7.12) that

$$|E\tilde{h}_b(\tilde{x})| \sim \chi_{N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z+b)}(x) E h(x).$$

Using Lemma 3.4 again, we have

$$(7.14) \quad \|\tilde{h}_b\|_{L^2}^2 \sim R^{-1/2-\delta_m} \|Eh\|_{L^2(B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}) \cap N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z+b))}^2.$$

These observations lead to a couple estimates about how $\|\tilde{h}_b\|_{L^2}$ relates to $\|h\|_{L^2}$.

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose that h is concentrated on wave packets in $\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ for some $(\tilde{\theta}, w)$, and x_0 is in the tube $T_{\tilde{\theta},w}$. If we choose a set of vectors $b \in B_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}$ so that the sets*

$$B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}) \cap N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z+b)$$

are disjoint, then

$$\sum_b \|\tilde{h}_b\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|h\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Finally, we come to transverse equidistribution estimates. Combining the transverse equidistribution estimate in Lemma 6.2 with the considerations in this section, we get the following estimates.

Lemma 7.5. *Suppose that h is concentrated on wave packets in $\mathbb{T}_Z$ and also on wave packets in $\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ for some $(\tilde{\theta}, w)$. Then for any $b \in B_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}$, we have*

$$\|\tilde{h}_b\|_{L^2}^2 \leq R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \|h\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Proof. We combine (7.14), Lemma 6.2, and (7.13):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{h}_b\|_{L^2}^2 &\sim R^{-1/2-\delta_m} \|Eh\|_{L^2(B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}) \cap N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z+b))}^2 \\ &\lesssim R^{-1/2-\delta_m} R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \|Eh\|_{L^2(B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}))}^2 \\ &\sim R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \|h\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

We can now combine the different $(\tilde{\theta}, w)$ in order to get estimates for g .

Lemma 7.6. *If g is concentrated in wave packets in $\mathbb{T}_Z$, then for any b ,*

$$\|\tilde{g}_b\|_{L^2}^2 \leq R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \|g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Proof. We first expand $g = \sum_{\tilde{\theta},w} g_{\tilde{\theta},w}$. The wave packets contributing significantly to each $g_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ are a subset of those contributing to g , and so each $g_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ is concentrated on wave packets in $\mathbb{T}_Z$. For each $\tilde{\theta}, w$, Lemma 7.5 tells us that

$$\|(g_{\tilde{\theta},w})_b\|_{L^2}^2 \leq R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \|g_{\tilde{\theta},w}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

We know that the $g_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ are orthogonal, and so

$$\|g\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_{\tilde{\theta},w} \|g_{\tilde{\theta},w}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The operation $f \mapsto \tilde{f}_b$ is a linear map, and so

$$\tilde{g}_b = \sum_{\tilde{\theta}, w} (g_{\tilde{\theta}, w})_b^\sim.$$

We claim that this is also an orthogonal decomposition. By Lemma 7.3, $(g_{\tilde{\theta}, w})^\sim$ is concentrated on wave packets in $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\tilde{\theta}, w}$. But then $(g_{\tilde{\theta}, w})_b^\sim$ is also concentrated on wave packets in $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\tilde{\theta}, w}$. The different sets $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\tilde{\theta}, w}$ are disjoint, and so the functions $(g_{\tilde{\theta}, w})_b^\sim$ are orthogonal, as claimed. Therefore

$$\|\tilde{g}_b\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_{\tilde{\theta}, w} \|(g_{\tilde{\theta}, w})_b^\sim\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Combining these estimates gives the desired conclusion. $\square$

8. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5.

We now formulate the inductive estimate that proves Theorem 1.5.

Proposition 8.1. *For $\epsilon > 0$, there are small constants $0 < \delta \ll \delta_{n-1} \ll \dots \ll \delta_1 \ll \delta_0 \ll \epsilon$, and a large constant $\bar{A}$ so that the following holds.*

Let m be a dimension in the range $1 \leq m \leq n$. Suppose that $Z = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m})$ is a transverse complete intersection where $\text{Deg } P_i \leq D_Z$. Suppose that f is concentrated on wave packets from $\mathbb{T}_Z$. Then for any $1 \leq A \leq \bar{A}$, and any radius $1 \leq R$,

$$(8.1) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \leq C(K, \epsilon, m, D_Z) R^\epsilon R^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log A)} R^{-e + \frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^2},$$

for all

$$(8.2) \quad 2 \leq p \leq \bar{p}(k, m) := 2 \cdot \frac{m+k}{m+k-2},$$

where

$$(8.3) \quad e = e(k, n, p) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} \right) (n+k).$$

When $m = n$, Proposition 8.1 gives Theorem 1.5. When $m = n$, we can take $Z = \mathbb{R}^n$ (and $D_Z = 1$). Now if we choose $A = \bar{A}$ and $p = \bar{p}(k, n)$, then we compute $-e + 1/2 = 0$, and we get the inequality in Theorem 1.5.

We prove Proposition 8.1 by induction. We will do induction on the dimension m , the radius R , and on A . We start by checking the base of the induction. When R is small, we choose the constant $C(K, \epsilon, m, D_Z)$ sufficiently large and the result follows. So from now on, we can assume that R is very large compared to K, ϵ, m, D_Z . To check the case $A = 1$, we choose $\bar{A}$ large enough so that $R^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log 1)} = R^{10n}$, and the inequality follows because $\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,1}^p(B_R)} \leq |B_R| \|f\|_{L^2}$. The base of the induction on m is $m = k - 1$. In this case, since $A \geq 1$, we have

$$(8.4) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \leq \text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

This follows from the definition of $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$. Recall that $\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p := \sum_{B_{K^2} \subset B_R} \mu_{Ef}(B_{K^2})$, where

$$\mu_{Ef}(B_{K^2}) := \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A \text{ } (k-1)\text{-subspaces of } \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\max_{\tau: \text{Angle}(G(\tau), V_a) > K^{-1} \text{ for all } a} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^p \right).$$

Fix a ball $B = B_{K^2} \subset N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B_R$, and let V be the tangent space to Z at some point z in the $R^{1/2+\delta_m}$ -neighborhood of the ball B_{K^2} . Notice that the dimension of V is $m = k - 1$. If $T_{\theta,v}$ intersects B_{K^2} and if $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_Z$, then $\text{Angle}(G(\theta), V) \lesssim R^{-1/2+\delta_m}$. So if τ contains a θ with $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_Z$ for some v , then $\text{Angle}(G(\tau), V) \leq K^{-1}$. On the other hand, if τ does not contain such a θ , then $\|f_\tau\|_{L^2} \leq \text{RapDec}(R)\|f\|_{L^2}$, because f is concentrated on wave packets tangent to Z . Therefore,

$$\left(\max_{\tau: \text{Angle}(G(\tau), V) > K^{-1}} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^p \right) \leq \text{RapDec}(R)\|f\|_{L^2}^p.$$

On the other hand, if $B_{K^2} \subset B_R$ is not contained in $N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z)$, then on B_{K^2} , $|Ef| \leq \text{RapDec}(R)\|f\|_{L^2}$. This proves (8.4), establishing the base case $m = k - 1$.

For $p = 2$, Proposition 8.1 follows quickly from the basic L^2 estimate in Lemma 3.2:

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^2(B_R)}^2 &\leq \sum_{\tau} \|Ef_\tau\|_{L^2(B_R)}^2 \\ &\lesssim R \sum_{\tau} \|f_\tau\|_{L^2}^2 = R\|f\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next we begin the inductive step. We assume that Proposition 8.1 holds if we decrease the dimension m , the radius R , or the value of A . We define p to be

$$p = \bar{p}(k, m) \text{ if } m > k,$$

$$p = \bar{p}(m, m) + \delta \text{ if } m = k.$$

We will check the main estimate (8.1) for this value of p . Once we check (8.1) for this value of p , we can get the whole range in (8.2) by interpolation between 2 and our value of p , using the Holder inequality for BL in Lemma 4.2.

There are two cases, depending on whether or not the mass of μ is concentrated into a small neighborhood of a lower dimensional variety. We let $D(\epsilon, D_Z)$ be a function that we will define later. We say we are in the algebraic case if there is a transverse complete intersection $Y^l \subset Z^m$ of dimension $l < m$, defined using polynomials of degree $\leq D(\epsilon, D_Z)$, so that

$$\mu_{Ef}(N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Y) \cap B_R) \gtrsim \mu_{Ef}(B_R).$$

Otherwise, we say that we are in the non-algebraic case, or the cellular case.

We begin with the non-algebraic case. In this case, we will use polynomial partitioning. To set up the polynomial partitioning, we first locate a significant piece of $N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B_R$ where the tangent space of Z is not changing too fast. We say that a ball $B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}) \subset N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B_R$ is regular if, on each connected component of $Z \cap B(x_0, 10R^{1/2+\delta_m})$, the tangent space TZ is constant up to angle $\frac{1}{100}$. Let $w \in \Lambda^m \mathbb{R}^n$. Recall that $Z_w \subset Z$ is defined in (5.2). For generic w , $Z_w \subset Y$ is a transverse complete intersection of dimension $m - 1$, defined using polynomials of degree $\lesssim D_Z$. We can choose a set of $\lesssim 1$ values of w so that on each connected component of $Z \setminus \cup_w Z_w$, the tangent plane TZ is constant up to angle $\frac{1}{100}$. Since we are in the non-algebraic case,

$$\mu_{Ef}(\cup_w N_{10R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z_w) \cap B_R) \leq \frac{1}{100} \mu_{Ef}(B_R).$$

Each ball $B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}) \subset N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B_R$ which does not intersect $\cup_w N_{10R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z_w)$ is a regular ball. So the regular balls contain most of the mass of μ .

For each regular ball $B = B_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}} \subset \tilde{N}_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B_R$, we pick a point $z \in Z \cap B_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}$ and we define V_B to be the m -plane $T_z Z$. For an m -plane V , we define $\mathfrak{B}_V$ to be the set of regular balls so that $\text{Angle}(V_B, V) \leq \frac{1}{100}$. By pigeonholing, we can choose a plane V so that

$$\mu_{Ef}(\cup_{B \in \mathfrak{B}_V} B) \gtrsim \mu_{Ef}(B_R).$$

We define $N_1 \subset N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B_R$ to be the union of the balls $B \in \mathfrak{B}_V$. We let μ_1 be the restriction of μ_{Ef} to N_1 , and we note that $\mu_1(N_1) \sim \mu_{Ef}(B_R)$.

Now we are ready to do polynomial partitioning. We let P_V denote a polynomial defined on V : $P_V : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow V$ be the orthogonal projection. Now we apply polynomial partitioning, Theorem 5.5, to the push-forward measure $\pi_* \mu_1$ on V , using the degree $D = D(\epsilon, D_Z)$. Theorem 5.5 gives us a non-zero polynomial P_V of degree at most D so that $V \setminus Z(P_V) = \cup_i O_{V,i}$, the number of cells $O_{V,i}$ is $\sim D^m$, and for each cell, $\pi_* \mu_1(O_{V,i})$ is $\sim D^{-m} \pi_* \mu_1(V)$. Moreover, $P_V = \prod_j Q_{V,j}$ where each $Q_{V,j}$ has a little freedom in the constant term, which we can use for transversality purposes.

We extend V to a polynomial P on $\mathbb{R}^n$ by setting $P(x) := P_V(\pi(x))$. We note that $Z(P) = \pi^{-1}(Z(P_V))$. We define $O_i := \pi^{-1} O_{V,i}$, and we note that $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus Z(P) = \cup_i O_i$ and that $\mu_1(O_i) = \pi_* \mu_1(O_{V,i}) \sim D^{-m} \mu_1(N_1)$. Similarly, we define $Q_j(x) = Q_{V,j}(\pi(x))$ so that $P = \prod_j Q_j$. Each Q_j is a polynomial of degree at most D on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and we have a little freedom in the constant term of each Q_j . By Lemma 5.1, we can guarantee that for each j , $Y_j = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n-m}, Q_j)$ is a transverse complete intersection.

We define $W := N_{R^{1/2+\delta}} Z(P)$, and $O'_i := O_i \setminus W$. Since each tube $T_{\theta,v}$ has radius $R^{1/2+\delta}$, each tube $T_{\theta,v}$ enters at most D of the cells O'_i . On the other hand, we claim that

$$W \cap N_1 \subset \bigcup_j N_{20R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Y_j).$$

Here is the proof of the claim. Suppose that $x \in W \cap N_1$. Since $x \in N_1$, x is in a regular ball $B = B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}) \in \mathfrak{B}_V$. There is a point $z_B \in Z \cap B$ with $\text{Angle}(T_{z_B} Z, V) \leq \frac{1}{100}$. Let Z_B be the component of $Z \cap 10B$ containing this point z_B . On Z_B , the tangent plane TZ makes a small angle with V . Let us use coordinates (v, w) , where $v \in V$ and $w \in V^\perp$. Since the tangent plane of TZ_B makes a small angle with V , Z_B is the graph of a function, $w = h(v)$, where h has small Lipschitz constant $\leq \frac{1}{100}$. Since $x \in W$, there must be a point $(v_0, w_0) \in Z(P) \cap B(x, R^{1/2+\delta})$. Since $P(v, w) = P_V(v)$ we see that $P_V(v_0) = 0$. Now the point $(v_0, h(v_0))$ lies both in $Z(P)$ and in Z_B , and so it lies in Y_j for some j . Since $(v_0, h(v_0)) \in Z_B \subset B(x_0, 10R^{1/2+\delta_m})$ and $x \in B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m})$, it follows that $x \in N_{20R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Y_j)$ as desired.

Since we are in the non-algebraic case, $\mu_1(N_{20R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Y_j))$ is negligible for each j , and so $\mu_1(W) = \mu_1(W \cap N_1)$ is negligible. Therefore, we have

$$(8.5) \quad \mu_1(O'_i) \sim D^{-m} \mu_1(N_1) \sim D^{-m} \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \text{ for the vast majority of } i.$$

Now for each index i we define a function f_i which only includes the wave packets that enter O'_i . More precisely, $f_i = \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_i} f_{\theta,v}$ where

$$(8.6) \quad \mathbb{T}_i := \{(\theta, v) \text{ such that } T_{\theta, v} \cap O'_i \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Each function f_i is also concentrated on wave packets in $\mathbb{T}_Z$. Moreover, there are $\sim D^m$ cells O'_i for which

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim D^m \mu_1(O'_i) \lesssim D^m \mu_{Ef_i}(O'_i) \lesssim D^m \|Ef_i\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p.$$

On the other hand, we have good control on the L^2 norms of f_i . Because each tube $T_{\theta, v}$ enters $\lesssim D$ cells O'_i , each pair (θ, v) belongs to $\mathbb{T}_i$ for $\lesssim D$ values of i , and so

$$\sum_i \|f_i\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_i \sum_{(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_i} \|f_{\theta, v}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim D \sum_{(\theta, v)} \|f_{\theta, v}\|_{L^2}^2 \sim D \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

In summary, there are $\sim D^m$ choices of i so that

$$(8.7) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim D^m \|Ef_i\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p.$$

$$(8.8) \quad \|f_i\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim D^{1-m} \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

(For later reference, we also record here: for each i and each θ ,

$$(8.9) \quad \|f_{i, \theta}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\theta' \cap \theta \neq \emptyset} \|f_{\theta'}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

This inequality doesn't appear in the proof of Theorem 1.5, but it could be useful in some later refinements.)

Using these estimates, we can now prove (8.1) by induction on the radius. To make the computation clearer, we abbreviate

$$E = \bar{C}(K, \epsilon, m, D_Z) R^\epsilon R^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log A)} R^{-e + \frac{1}{2}},$$

so (8.1) reduces to

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \leq E \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Since we assume that (8.1) holds on balls of radius $R/2$, it follows that it also holds on balls of radius R up to a constant factor loss. So we can assume that

$$(8.10) \quad \|Ef_i\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \leq CE \|f_i\|_{L^2}.$$

Now using (8.7) and (8.8), we get

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim D^m \|Ef_i\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim D^m E^p \|f_i\|_{L^2}^p \lesssim D^{m-(m-1)\frac{p}{2}} E^p \|f\|_{L^2}^p.$$

By our choice of p , $p > \frac{2m}{m-1}$, and so the exponent of D is negative. If $m > k$, the exponent is negative with pretty large absolute value; if $m = k$, then the exponent is $-\delta$. If we choose $D = D(\epsilon, D_Z)$ sufficiently large, the power of D dominates the implicit constant, and we get $\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \leq E \|f\|_{L^2}$, which closes the induction in the non-algebraic case.

Next we turn to the algebraic case. By definition, we know that there is a transverse complete intersection Y^l of dimension $l < m$, defined using polynomials of degree $\leq D = D(\epsilon, D_Z)$, so that

$$(8.11) \quad \mu_{Ef}(N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Y)) \gtrsim \mu_{Ef}(B_R).$$

In the algebraic case, we subdivide B_R into smaller balls B_j of radius ρ , chosen so that

$$(8.12) \quad \rho^{1/2+\delta_l} = R^{1/2+\delta_m}.$$

For each j , we define $f_j = \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_j} f_{\theta,v}$, where

$$\mathbb{T}_j := \{(\theta, v) | T_{\theta,v} \cap N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Y) \cap B_j \neq \emptyset\}.$$

On $N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Y) \cap B_j$, $Ef_j = Ef + \text{RapDec}(R)\|f\|_{L^2}$. Therefore,

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim \sum_j \|Ef_j\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_j)}^p + \text{RapDec}(R)\|f\|_{L^2}^p.$$

We further subdivide $\mathbb{T}_j$ into tubes that are tangential to Y and tubes that are transverse to Y . As in definition 6.1, we say that $T_{\theta,v}$ is tangent to Y in B_j if

$$(8.13) \quad T_{\theta,v} \cap 2B_j \subset N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Y) \cap 2B_j = N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_l}}(Y) \cap 2B_j,$$

and for any $x \in T_{\theta,v}$ and $y \in Y \cap 2B_j$ with $|x - y| \lesssim R^{1/2+\delta_m} = \rho^{1/2+\delta_l}$,

$$(8.14) \quad \text{Angle}(G(\theta), TY_y) \lesssim \rho^{-1/2+\delta_l}.$$

We define the tangential wave packets by

$$\mathbb{T}_{j,tang} = \{(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_j | T_{\theta,v} \text{ is tangent to } Y \text{ in } B_j\}.$$

And we define the transverse wave packets by

$$\mathbb{T}_{j,trans} := \mathbb{T}_j \setminus \mathbb{T}_{j,tang}.$$

We define $f_{j,tang} = \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_{j,tang}} f_{\theta,v}$ and $f_{j,trans} = \sum_{(\theta,v) \in \mathbb{T}_{j,trans}} f_{\theta,v}$ so

$$f_j = f_{j,tang} + f_{j,trans}.$$

Therefore we have

$$(8.15) \quad \sum_j \|Ef_j\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_j)}^p \lesssim \sum_j \|Ef_{j,tang}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}^p + \sum_j \|Ef_{j,trans}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}^p.$$

We will control the contribution of the tangential wave packets by induction on the dimension m , and we will control the contribution of the transverse wave packets by induction on the radius R .

Suppose first that the tangential wave packets dominate the right-hand side. In order to apply induction to $Ef_{j,tang}$ on B_j , we redo the wave packet decomposition at a scale appropriate to B_j , as in Section 7. For brevity, during this discussion, we let $g = f_{j,tang}$.

$$\tilde{g} = \sum_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} \tilde{g}_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} + \text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Before applying induction, we need to check that this wave packet decomposition is concentrated on pairs $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v})$ that are tangent to Y on B_j , in the sense of Definition 6.1: in other words on pairs $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v})$ so that

$$(8.16) \quad T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} \subset N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_l}}(Y) \cap B_j,$$

and for any $x \in T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ and $y \in Y \cap B_j$ with $|x - y| \lesssim \rho^{1/2+\delta_l}$,

$$(8.17) \quad \text{Angle}(G(\tilde{\theta}), T_y Y) \lesssim \rho^{-1/2+\delta_l}.$$

We know that $g = f_{j, \text{tang}}$ is concentrated on wave packets $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{j, \text{tang}}$, which obey (8.13) and (8.14). These tell us that $T_{\theta, v} \cap B_j$ lies in the desired neighborhood of $Y \cap B_j$ and makes a good angle with $T_y Y$. For any (θ, v) , $(f_{\theta, v})^\sim$ is concentrated on wave packets $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta, v}$, by Lemma 7.1. For $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta, v}$, (7.2) and (7.3) tell us that $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ lies in a small neighborhood of $T_{\theta, v} \cap B_j$ and makes a small angle with $T_{\theta, v}$. So if $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{j, \text{tang}}$ and $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\theta, v}$, then $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ obeys (8.16) and (8.17). We have now checked the hypotheses of Proposition 8.1 for $\tilde{g}$ with the variety Y on the ball B_j , and so we can apply induction on the dimension.

By induction on the dimension, we get the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ef_{j, \text{tang}}\|_{\text{BL}_{k, A/2}^p(B_j)} &= \|E\tilde{g}\|_{\text{BL}_{k, A/2}^p(B_\rho)} \\ &\leq C(K, \epsilon/2, l, D(\epsilon, D_Z)) \rho^{\epsilon/2} \rho^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log(A/2))} \rho^{-e+\frac{1}{2}} \|f_{j, \text{tang}}\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

for

$$2 \leq p \leq \bar{p}(k, l) := 2 \cdot \frac{l+k}{l+k-2},$$

where

$$e = e(k, n, p) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} \right) (n+k).$$

Since $l < m$, $\bar{p}(k, m) < \bar{p}(k, l)$, and so our value of p is in the range $2 \leq p \leq \bar{p}(k, l)$ and the bound above applies. The number of balls B_j is $\lesssim R^{O(\delta_l)}$. Summing brutally over the balls, we see that

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k, A}^p(B_R)} \lesssim R^{O(\delta_l)} C(K, \epsilon/2, l, D(\epsilon, D_Z)) \rho^{\epsilon/2} \rho^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log(A/2))} \rho^{-e+\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

We note that the exponent $-e+1/2$ may well be negative. Nevertheless, $\rho^{-e+1/2} \leq R^{O(\delta_l)} R^{-e+1/2}$. Also, $\rho^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log A/2)} \leq R^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log A/2)} = R^\delta R^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log A)}$. Therefore, the last expression is

$$\leq R^{O(\delta_l)} C(K, \epsilon/2, l, D(\epsilon, D_Z)) R^{\epsilon/2} R^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log(A/2))} R^{-e+\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Since δ_l is much smaller than ϵ , $R^{O(\delta_l)} R^{\epsilon/2}$ is smaller than R^ϵ and the induction closes. (We have to choose $C(K, \epsilon, m, D_Z)$ larger than $C(K, \epsilon/2, l, D(\epsilon, D_Z))$.) This finishes the discussion of the tangential algebraic case.

Suppose now that the transverse wave packets dominate (8.15). First, we note that

$$\sum_j \|f_{j,trans}\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{\theta,v} |\{j : (\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{j,trans}\}| \|f_{\theta,v}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Next we claim that for each (θ, v) , $|\{j : (\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{j,trans}\}| \lesssim_{\epsilon, D_Z} 1$. In the discussion, we just abbreviate this as $\lesssim 1$. This follows from Lemma 5.7, which controls the transverse intersections between a tube and an algebraic variety. Let T be the cylinder with the same center as $T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}$ and with radius $r = R^{1/2+\delta_m} = \rho^{1/2+\delta_l}$, and let $\alpha = \rho^{-1/2+\delta_l}$. Let ℓ denote the central axis of T and recall that $Y_{>\alpha}$ is the set $\{y \in Y \mid \text{Angle}(T_y Y, \ell) > \alpha\}$. If $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{j,trans}$, then $T \cap Y_{>\alpha} \cap 2B_j$ must be non-empty. However, Lemma 5.7 tells us that $T \cap Y_{>\alpha}$ is contained in $\leq CD_Y^2$ balls of radius $\lesssim r\alpha^{-1} \sim \rho$. Here Y is defined by polynomials of degree $D_Y \leq D(\epsilon, D_Z) \lesssim 1$. Therefore, $(\theta, v) \in \mathbb{T}_{j,trans}$ for $\lesssim 1$ values of j . Plugging this into the last equation, we get

$$(8.18) \quad \sum_j \|f_{j,trans}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Next we would like to study $Ef_{j,trans}$ on each ball B_j by doing induction on the radius. In order to do so, we redo the wave packet decomposition at a scale appropriate to B_j , as in Section 7. For brevity, during this discussion, we let $g = f_{j,trans}$.

$$\tilde{g} = \sum_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} \tilde{g}_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} + \text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

We recall a couple definitions from Section 7. For any $b \in B_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}$, we define

$$\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{Z+b} := \{(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) : T_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}} \text{ is tangent to } Z+b \text{ in } B_j\}.$$

$$\tilde{g}_b := \sum_{(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{Z+b}} \tilde{g}_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{v}}.$$

For each b , $\tilde{g}_b$ is concentrated in wave packets tangent to $Z+b$ in the ball B_j , and so we will be able to apply induction on the radius to study $E\tilde{g}_b$. By (7.12), if y_j is the center of B_j and $x = y_j + \tilde{x} \in B_j$, then

$$(8.19) \quad |E\tilde{g}_b(\tilde{x})| \sim \chi_{N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z+b)}(x) |Eg(x)|.$$

We define $f_{j,trans,b}$ so that $(f_{j,trans,b})^\sim = \tilde{g}_b$ (in other words, $f_{j,trans,b} = e^{-i\psi_y(\omega)} \tilde{g}_b$). In this language, the last equation becomes

$$(8.20) \quad |Ef_{j,trans,b}(x)| \sim \chi_{N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z+b)}(x) |Ef_{j,trans}(x)|.$$

Next we choose a set of vectors $b \in B_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}$. The number of vectors b that we choose is related to the geometry of Z . We cover $N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B_j$ with disjoint balls of radius $R^{1/2+\delta_m}$, and in each ball B we note the volume of $B \cap N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z)$. We dyadically pigeonhole this volume: for each s we consider

$$\mathfrak{B}_s := \{B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}) \subset N_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z) \cap B_j : |B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}) \cap N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z)| \sim 2^s\}.$$

We select a value of s so that

$$\|Ef_{j,trans}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(\cup_{B \in \mathfrak{B}_s} B)} \gtrsim (\log R)^{-1} \|Ef_{j,trans}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}.$$

Next we prune $\mathbb{T}_{j,trans}$ a little: we include (θ, v) only if $T_{\theta,v}$ intersects one of the balls of $\mathfrak{B}_s$. To avoid making the notation even heavier, we don't make a separate notation for the pruned set. This pruning can only decrease $\|f_{j,trans}\|_{L^2}$, and it changes $\|Ef_{j,trans}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}^p$ by at most a factor of $\log R$.

Now we are ready to choose our set of translations $\{b\}$. We choose a random set of $|B_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}|/2^s$ vectors $b \in B_{R^{1/2+\delta_m}}$. For a typical ball $B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}) \in \mathfrak{B}_s$, the union $\cup_b N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z+b)$ covers a definite fraction of the ball (in a random way). Therefore, with high probability, we get

$$(8.21) \quad \|Ef_{j,trans}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}^p \lesssim \sum_b \|Ef_{j,trans,b}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z+b) \cap B_j)}^p.$$

On the other hand, a typical point of $B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m})$ lies in $\lesssim 1$ of the sets $N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z+b)$. Because of this geometric fact, we claim that

$$(8.22) \quad \sum_b \|\tilde{g}_b\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

To see this, we decompose $g = \sum_{\tilde{\theta},w} g_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ as in Section 7. If $g_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ is not negligible, then $T_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ must intersect one of the balls $B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m}) \in \mathfrak{B}_s$. Since the sets $N_{\rho^{1/2+\delta_m}}(Z+b) \cap B(x_0, R^{1/2+\delta_m})$ are essentially disjoint, Lemma 7.4 tells us that

$$\sum_b \|(g_{\tilde{\theta},w})_{\tilde{b}}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|g_{\tilde{\theta},w}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

But (as we saw in the proof of Lemma 7.6),

$$\tilde{g}_b = \sum_{\tilde{\theta},w} (g_{\tilde{\theta},w})_{\tilde{b}}$$

is an orthogonal decomposition, and $g = \sum_{\tilde{\theta},w} g_{\tilde{\theta},w}$ is an orthogonal decomposition, and so

$$\sum_b \|\tilde{g}_b\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_{b,\tilde{\theta},w} \|(g_{\tilde{\theta},w})_{\tilde{b}}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\tilde{\theta},w} \|g_{\tilde{\theta},w}\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \|g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

We now have all the estimates that we need in the transverse case, and we collect them here.

$$(8.23) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim \log R \sum_{j,b} \|Ef_{j,trans,b}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}^p.$$

$$(8.24) \quad \sum_{j,b} \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

By Lemma 7.6,

$$(8.25) \quad \max_b \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \|f_{j,trans}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

(For later reference, we also record here: for each j, b and each $\tilde{\theta}$,

$$(8.26) \quad \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\theta})}^2 \lesssim R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)} \|f\|_{L^2(2\tilde{\theta})}^2.$$

This follows from Lemma 7.6. This inequality doesn't appear in the proof of Theorem 1.5, but it could be useful in some later refinements.)

By induction on the radius, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ef_{j,trans,b}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)} &\leq C(K, \epsilon, m, D_Z) \rho^\epsilon \rho^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log(A/2))} \rho^{-e+\frac{1}{2}} \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(K, \epsilon, m, D_Z) R^\delta \rho^\epsilon R^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log A)} \rho^{-e+\frac{1}{2}} \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using these estimates, we can now prove (8.1) by induction on the radius.

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p &\lesssim (\log R) \sum_{j,b} \|Ef_{j,trans,b}\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A/2}^p(B_j)}^p \\ &\leq R^{O(\delta)} \left(C(K, \epsilon, m, D_Z) \rho^\epsilon R^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log(A/2))} \rho^{-e+\frac{1}{2}} \right)^p \sum_{j,b} \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Using (8.25) and (8.24),

$$\sum_{j,b} \|f_{j,trans,b}\|_{L^2}^p \lesssim R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)(\frac{p}{2}-1)} \|f\|_{L^2}^p.$$

Now plugging in we get

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \lesssim R^{O(\delta_m)} \left(C(K, \epsilon, m, D_Z) \rho^\epsilon R^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log A)} \rho^{-e+\frac{1}{2}} \right)^p \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)(\frac{p}{2}-1)} \|f\|_{L^2}^p.$$

At the exponent $p = \bar{p}(k, m)$,

$$\left(\rho^{-e+1/2} \right)^p \left(\frac{R^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)^{-(n-m)(\frac{p}{2}-1)} = \left(R^{-e+1/2} \right)^p.$$

(If $m = k$, so that $p = \bar{p}(k, m) + \delta$, then this is true up to a factor $R^{O(\delta)}$.) So plugging in our values of p and e , and multiplying out, we get

$$\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)}^p \leq C R^{O(\delta_m)} (R/\rho)^{-\epsilon} \left(C(K, \epsilon, m, D_Z) R^\epsilon R^{\delta(\log \bar{A} - \log A)} R^{-e+\frac{1}{2}} \right)^p \|f\|_{L^2}^p.$$

Here the constant C coming from $\lesssim$'s may depend on ϵ, D_Z , the dimension etc. We have to check that $C R^{O(\delta_m)} (R/\rho)^{-\epsilon} \leq 1$. Note that $R/\rho = R^{\theta(\delta_l)}$. We choose the δ 's so that $\delta_m \ll \epsilon \delta_{m-1}$, and so $(R/\rho)^{-\epsilon}$ dominates the other terms. Therefore, the induction closes in the transverse algebraic case also.

This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.5.

9. GOING FROM k -BROAD ESTIMATES TO REGULAR ESTIMATES

The paper [BG] introduces a technique to go from multilinear estimates to regular L^p estimates. In this section, we follow this technique to go from k -broad estimates to regular L^p estimates.

Proposition 9.1. *Suppose that for all K, ϵ , the operator E obeys the k -broad inequality:*

$$(9.1) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \lesssim_{K,\epsilon} R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^q}.$$

(Here the quantities k, A, p, q , are fixed, and the inequality holds for all R .)
If $p \leq q \leq \infty$ and p is in the range

$$(9.2) \quad 2 \cdot \frac{2n-k+2}{2n-k} \leq p \leq 2 \cdot \frac{k-1}{k-2},$$

then E obeys

$$(9.3) \quad \|Ef\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim_\epsilon R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^q}.$$

Remarks. The lower bound on p is important. The upper bound is less important, and it could probably be improved.

Theorem 1.5 together with Proposition 9.1 implies Theorem 1.1. If n is even, we use $k = \frac{n}{2} + 1$. By Theorem 1.5, we have $\|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^p}$ for p slightly bigger than $\bar{p}(k, n) = 2 \cdot \frac{n+k}{n+k-2}$. With our choice of k , we also have $\bar{p}(k, n) = 2 \cdot \frac{2n-k+2}{2n-k}$. Applying Proposition 9.1, we get $\|Ef\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^p}$ for p slightly bigger than $\bar{p}(k, n)$. Interpolating with the trivial L^∞ bound gives this estimate for all $p > \bar{p}(k, n)$. Finally, applying ϵ -removal ([T1]) gives Theorem 1.1. If n is odd, we use $k = \frac{n+1}{2}$. The argument is the same, (but in this case, $\bar{p}(k, n) > 2 \cdot \frac{2n-k+2}{2n-k}$).

Proof. By hypothesis, we have an inequality of the form

$$(9.4) \quad \sum_{B_{K^2} \subset B_R} \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \max_{\tau \notin V_a} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^p \leq C(K, \epsilon) R^{p\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^q}^p.$$

Here $V_1, \dots, V_A$ are $(k-1)$ -planes, and we write $\tau \notin V_a$ as an abbreviation for $\text{Angle}(G(\tau), V_a) > K^{-1}$.

For each B_{K^2} , we fix a choice of $V_1, \dots, V_A$ achieving the minimum above. Then we can write

$$(9.5) \quad \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef|^p \lesssim K^{O(1)} \max_{\tau \notin V_a} \int_{B_{K^2}} |Ef_\tau|^p + \sum_{a=1}^A \int_{B_{K^2}} \left| \sum_{\tau \in V_a} Ef_\tau \right|^p.$$

The first term is the “broad” part, and it can be controlled by the k -broad estimate. We handle the second term, the “narrow” part, by a decoupling-type argument. We work with B_{K^2} so that we can cleanly apply the decoupling theorem from [B4]. (The paper [BG] contains a different but closely related argument.)

Theorem 9.2. ([B4]) *Suppose that $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $\hat{g}$ supported in the K^{-2} -neighborhood of the truncated paraboloid. Divide this neighborhood into slabs τ with $k-1$ long directions of length K^{-1} and one short direction of length K^{-2} . Write $g = \sum_\tau g_\tau$, where $\hat{g}_\tau = \chi_\tau \hat{g}$. Then on any ball of radius K^2 , for $2 \leq p \leq 2 \cdot \frac{m}{m-1}$,*

$$(9.6) \quad \|g\|_{L^p(B_{K^2})} \lesssim_\delta K^\delta \left(\sum_\tau \|g_\tau\|_{L^p(W_{B_{K^2}})}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where $W_{B_{K^2}}$ is a weight measure, approximately the volume measure on B_{K^2} and rapidly decaying.

Applying this decoupling estimate with $m = k - 1$, we get the following lemma:

Lemma 9.3.

$$\left(\int_{B_{K^2}} \left| \sum_{\tau \in V_a} E f_\tau \right|^p \right)^{1/p} \lesssim_\delta K^\delta \left[\sum_{\tau \in V_a} \left(\int W_{B_{K^2}} |E f_\tau|^p \right)^{2/p} \right]^{1/2}.$$

Proof. On B_{K^2} , we use coordinates (u, v) where v is parallel to V_a and u is perpendicular to V_a . We write B_{u, K^2} for a ball of radius K^2 in the u -coordinates and B_{v, K^2} for a ball of radius K^2 in the v coordinates. If we restrict $E f_\tau$ to the $k - 1$ -plane $\{u\} \times \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$ (parallel to V_a), then its Fourier transform is supported in the K^{-2} neighborhood of a cap τ' in the K^{-2} -neighborhood of a paraboloid. By Theorem 9.2, we get

$$\left\| \sum_{\tau \in V_a} E f_\tau \right\|_{L^p(\{u\} \times B_{v, K^2})} \lesssim_\delta K^\delta \left(\sum_{\tau \in V_a} \|E f_\tau\|_{L^p(\{u\} \times W_{B_{v, K^2}})}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Using Fubini and Minkowski, we then get

$$\left\| \sum_{\tau \in V_a} E f_\tau \right\|_{L^p(B_{u, K^2} \times B_{v, K^2})} \lesssim_\delta K^\delta \left(\sum_{\tau \in V_a} \|E f_\tau\|_{L^p(W_{B_{K^2}})}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

□

The number of $\tau \in V_a$ is $\lesssim K^{k-2}$. Applying Holder's inequality, we see that

$$(9.7) \quad \int_{B_{K^2}} \left| \sum_{\tau \in V_a} E f_\tau \right|^p \lesssim_\delta K^\delta K^{(k-2)(\frac{p}{2}-1)} \sum_{\tau \in V_a} \int W_{B_{K^2}} |E f_\tau|^p.$$

At this point, we have gotten as much as we can from the knowledge that $\tau \in V_a$, and we relax this estimate to

$$(9.8) \quad \int_{B_{K^2}} \left| \sum_{\tau \in V_a} E f_\tau \right|^p \lesssim_\delta K^\delta K^{(k-2)(\frac{p}{2}-1)} \sum_\tau \int W_{B_{K^2}} |E f_\tau|^p.$$

Next we sum this inequality over all $a = 1, \dots, A$ and over all $B_{K^2} \subset B_R$. We let $W = \sum_{B_{K^2} \subset B_R} W_{B_{K^2}}$.

$$(9.9) \quad \sum_{B_{K^2} \subset B_R} \sum_{a=1}^A \int_{B_{K^2}} \left| \sum_{\tau \in V_a} E f_\tau \right|^p \lesssim K^\delta K^{(k-2)(\frac{p}{2}-1)} \sum_\tau \int W |E f_\tau|^p.$$

We note that $W \lesssim 1$ on B_{2R} and $W \leq \text{RapDec}(R)$ outside B_{2R} . Therefore we get

$$(9.10) \quad \sum_{B_{K^2} \subset B_R} \sum_{a=1}^A \int_{B_{K^2}} \left| \sum_{\tau \in V_a} E f_\tau \right|^p \lesssim K^\delta K^{(k-2)(\frac{p}{2}-1)} \sum_{\tau} \int_{B_{2R}} |E f_\tau|^p + \text{RapDec}(R) \|f\|_{L^q}^p.$$

Combining this estimate for the narrow part with our estimate for the broad part, we have

$$(9.11) \quad \int_{B_R} |E f|^p \leq C(K, \epsilon) R^{p\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^q}^p + C K^\delta K^{(k-2)(\frac{p}{2}-1)} \sum_{\tau} \int_{B_{2R}} |E f_\tau|^p.$$

With this inequality in hand, we will prove (9.3) by induction on the radius, where we use the induction assumption in order to handle the contribution of the f_τ terms. The inequality we wish to prove is

$$(9.12) \quad \int_{B_R} |E f|^p \leq \bar{C}(\epsilon) R^{p\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^q}^p.$$

By induction on the radius we can assume that (9.12) holds for radii less than $R/2$. We use this induction and parabolic rescaling to handle the contribution of each f_τ .

On the ball τ we introduce new coordinates. Let ω_τ be the center of τ , and recall that the radius of τ is K^{-1} . Then we introduce a new coordinate $\tilde{\omega} \in B^{n-1}$, by

$$(9.13) \quad \tilde{\omega} = K(\omega - \omega_\tau).$$

We rewrite the phase in these coordinates:

$$x_1 \omega_1 + \dots + x_{n-1} \omega_{n-1} + x_n |\omega_n|^2 = \text{Fcn}(x) + \tilde{x}_1 \tilde{\omega}_1 + \dots + \tilde{x}_{n-1} \tilde{\omega}_{n-1} + \tilde{x}_n |\tilde{\omega}|^2,$$

where $\text{Fcn}(x)$ denotes a function of x only and

$$\tilde{x}_j = K^{-1}(x_j + 2\omega_{\tau,j} x_n) \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq n-1; \tilde{x}_n = K^{-2} x_n.$$

Here $\omega_{\tau,j}$ denotes the j^{th} coordinate of ω_τ . Note that the linear transformation $x \mapsto \tilde{x}$ sends B_R into $B_{CRK^{-1}}$ and has Jacobian $\sim K^{-(n+1)}$.

We define

$$\tilde{f}_\tau(\tilde{\omega}) = f_\tau(\omega) = f_\tau(K^{-1}\tilde{\omega} + \omega_\tau),$$

so that

$$|E f_\tau(x)| = K^{-(n-1)} |E \tilde{f}_\tau(\tilde{x})|.$$

By induction on the radius, we can assume that (9.12) holds for $\tilde{f}_\tau$ on a ball of radius CRK^{-1} :

$$\int_{B_{CRK^{-1}}} |E \tilde{f}_\tau|^p \lesssim \bar{C}(\epsilon) R^{p\epsilon} K^{-p\epsilon} \|\tilde{f}_\tau\|_{L^q}^p.$$

By change of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{2R}} |E f_\tau|^p &\lesssim K^{(n+1)} K^{-(n-1)p} \int_{B_{CRK^{-1}}} |E \tilde{f}_\tau|^p \lesssim \\ &\lesssim \bar{C}(\epsilon) (R/K)^{p\epsilon} K^{(n+1)-(n-1)p} \|\tilde{f}_\tau\|_{L^q}^p = \bar{C}(\epsilon) R^{p\epsilon} K^{(n+1)-(n-1)p-p\epsilon} K^{(n-1)\frac{p}{q}} \|f_\tau\|_{L^q}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this bound into (9.11), we get

$$(9.14) \quad \int_{B_R} |Ef|^p \leq C(K, \epsilon) R^{p\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^q}^p + C\bar{C}(\epsilon) R^{p\epsilon} K^{(k-2)(\frac{p}{2}-1)+(n+1)-(n-1)p-p\epsilon+\delta} K^{(n-1)\frac{p}{q}} \sum_{\tau} \|f_{\tau}\|_{L^q}^p.$$

There are K^{n-1} different $\theta \subset B^{n-1}$. Since $p \leq q$, we can apply Holder to see that

$$\sum_{\tau} \|f_{\tau}\|_{L^q}^p \leq \left(\sum_{\tau} \|f_{\tau}\|_{L^q}^q \right)^{p/q} K^{(n-1)(1-\frac{p}{q})} = \|f\|_{L^q}^p K^{(n-1)(1-\frac{p}{q})}.$$

Plugging this into the last inequality, we see that the dependence on q drops out, and we are left with:

$$(9.15) \quad \int_{B_R} |Ef|^p \leq C(K, \epsilon) R^{p\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^q}^p + C\bar{C}(\epsilon) R^{p\epsilon} K^{(k-2)(\frac{p}{2}-1)+(n+1)-(n-1)p+(n-1)-p\epsilon+\delta} \|f\|_{L^q}^p.$$

We can close the induction as long as the exponent of K is negative. (First we choose K large enough so that the second term is bounded by $(1/2)\bar{C}(\epsilon) R^{p\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^p}^p$. Then we choose $\bar{C}(\epsilon)$ sufficiently large so that the first term is also bounded by $(1/2)\bar{C}(\epsilon) R^{p\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^p}^p$.) Given $\epsilon > 0$, we can choose $\delta < \epsilon$. So the induction closes as long as

$$(k-2) \left(\frac{p}{2} - 1 \right) + (n+1) - (n-1)p + (n-1) \leq 0.$$

This is equivalent with the lower bound for p in our hypothesis (9.2): $2 \cdot \frac{2n-k+2}{2n-k} \leq p$. $\square$

10. APPENDIX: KEEPING TRACK OF PARAMETERS

We have several small parameters. In this appendix, we try to provide a reference to help the reader keep track of the parameters. We list all the parameters, how they compare to each other, and where they appear in the argument.

We begin with the small parameters. For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a sequence of small parameters

$$\delta \ll \delta_{n-1} \ll \delta_{n-2} \ll \dots \ll \delta_1 \ll \delta_0 \ll \epsilon.$$

In this sequence, each parameter is far smaller than the next. For instance, we will use that $\delta_m < \epsilon \delta_{m-1}$.

The parameter δ appears in the wave packet decomposition. The tubes $T_{\theta,v}$ in the wave packet decomposition have thickness $R^{1/2+\delta}$. The parameter δ_m appears in the m -dimensional case of the main inductive estimate, Proposition 8.1: in this estimate we suppose that $f = \sum_{\theta,v} f_{\theta,v}$ is concentrated on wave packets that are $R^{-1/2+\delta_m}$ -tangent to Z on the ball B_R .

Another geometric parameter that appears is the radius ρ . In the transverse algebraic case, we decompose B_R into smaller balls B_j . If we are working on tubes that cluster in the neighborhood of an m -dimensional variety Z , and are transverse to an l -dimensional variety Y , then the radius of each B_j is ρ given by

$$\rho^{1/2+\delta_l} = R^{1/2+\delta_m}.$$

The quotient R/ρ has size $R^{\theta(\delta_l)}$, which dominates $R^{O(\delta_m)}$.

Then there are positive parameters K, A . We have

$$1 \ll A \ll K.$$

We need $A = A(\epsilon)$ sufficiently large to run the proof of Theorem 1.5, and the broad inequality is most useful when K is much larger than A .

Given ϵ , we then fix the small parameters δ and the larger parameters A, K . Then we consider $R \rightarrow \infty$. In the statement of Theorem 1.5, the constant depends on ϵ and on K . By choosing this constant large enough, the theorem holds trivially unless R is very large compared to all these fixed parameters.

11. FURTHER DIRECTIONS

11.1. Variable coefficient operators. I believe that the results in this paper extend to a more general class of variable-coefficient operators, and for this more general class of operators, the results would be sharp up to factors of R^ϵ . To formulate this more general setup, we first write the extension operator E in a slightly different form. We write $y = (y', y_n)$, and we define the phase function

$$(11.1) \quad \Psi_{par}(y, \omega) := y' \cdot \omega + y_n |\omega|^2.$$

We write B_R or B_R^n for the ball of radius R (centered at 0) in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For $x \in B_R$, it is convenient to write $Ef(x)$ in the form

$$Ef(x) = \int_{B^{n-1}} e^{iR\Psi_{par}(\frac{x}{R}, \omega)} f(\omega) d\omega.$$

We think of Ψ_{par} as a function from $B^n \times B^{n-1}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. We now consider other phase functions $\Psi(y, \omega)$, which are small real-analytic perturbations of $\Psi_{par}(y, \omega)$ on $B^n \times B^{n-1}$, and we define

$$(11.2) \quad Tf(x) = \int_{B^{n-1}} e^{iR\Psi(\frac{x}{R}, \omega)} f(\omega) d\omega.$$

We call such an operator a Hormander-type operator with positive definite phase. Hormander introduced this type of operator in [H]. Positive definite phase refers to the fact that the quadratic form $\omega \mapsto |\omega|^2$ is positive definite. See also [BG] for more background on this type of operator.

Conjecture 11.1. *Suppose that Ψ is a Hormander-type operator with positive definite phase. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, the operator T obeys the estimate*

$$(11.3) \quad \|Tf\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim_\epsilon R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^p(B^{n-1})},$$

if

$$p \geq 2 \cdot \frac{3n+1}{3n-3} \text{ for } n \text{ odd},$$

$$p \geq 2 \cdot \frac{3n+2}{3n-2} \text{ for } n \text{ even}.$$

Conjecture 11.1 was proven for $n = 2$ by Hormander in [H] and for $n = 3$ by Lee in [L] (and a different proof was given in [BG]). It is open for $n \geq 4$. (The best current estimates are given by Theorem 3 in [BG].)

The more general operator T also has a wave packet decomposition, except that the tubes are curved instead of straight. The function $Tf_{\theta,v}$ is essentially supported on a curved tube $T_{\theta,v} \subset B_R$, with radius $R^{1/2+\delta}$ and length R . After restricting to a slightly smaller ball (of radius $R^{1-\delta}$), we can assume that $T_{\theta,v}$ is the $R^{1/2+\delta}$ -neighborhood of an algebraic curve of degree at most $C(n, \delta)$.

The range of p in Conjecture 11.1 cannot be improved because of examples in which the wave packets $T_{\theta,v}$ concentrate near to a low-degree variety Z . If n is even, then the dimension of Z is $\frac{n+2}{2}$, and if n is odd, the dimension of Z is $\frac{n+1}{2}$. With this choice of dimension, it can happen that for every θ , there is some $v = v(\theta)$ so that $T_{\theta,v(\theta)} \subset N_{R^{1/2+\delta}}(Z)$. We choose $f_{\theta,v}$ so that $|Tf_{\theta,v}(x)| \sim 1$ on $T_{\theta,v}$ (and rapidly decaying away from $T_{\theta,v}$). Then we let $f = \sum_{\theta} f_{\theta,v(\theta)}$. In this setup, $\|f\|_{L^2} \sim \|f\|_{L^\infty}$. Also, $\|Tf\|_{L^2} \sim R^{1/2}\|f\|_{L^2}$, and Tf is essentially supported in the $R^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of Z . By Holder's inequality, we see that $\|Tf\|_{L^p(B_R)} \gg \|f\|_{L^2} \sim \|f\|_{L^\infty}$ for any p smaller than the range in the conjecture.

We describe briefly the history of this question. More general oscillatory integral operators of the form (11.2) were first considered by Hormander in [H]. He proved Theorem 11.1 for $n = 2$, and raised questions about higher dimensions. In fact, he considered a somewhat more general setting. For a non-degenerate quadratic form $Q(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{n-1})$, define Ψ_Q by

$$(11.4) \quad \Psi_Q(y, \omega) := y_1\omega_1 + \dots + y_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} + y_n Q(\omega)$$

We define the corresponding extension operator E_Q by

$$(11.5) \quad E_Q f(x) = \int_{B^{n-1}} e^{iR\Psi_Q(x/R, \omega)} f(\omega) d\omega.$$

Then we let $\Psi(y, \omega)$ be a small real analytic perturbation of Ψ_Q on $B^n \times B^{n-1}$ and define Tf by

$$(11.6) \quad Tf(x) := \int_{B^{n-1}} e^{iR\Psi(x/R, \omega)} f(\omega) d\omega.$$

If Q is positive definite, then this class of operators is equivalent to the operators in definition (11.2), but Q may have a mix of positive and negative eigenvalues. We call such an operator T an operator of Hormander type. What L^p estimates must such an operator T obey? The first result in higher dimensions was proven by Stein in [S2]:

Theorem 11.2. ([S2]) *Suppose that T is an operator of Hormander type. Then $\|Tf\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(B^{n-1})}$ for $p \geq 2 \cdot \frac{n+1}{n-1}$.*

Up to this point in the development of the theory, most people believed that the small perturbation in the phase function Ψ should not have an effect on the L^p estimates, and that T should obey all the same L^p estimates as E_Q or E . But in [B2], Bourgain proved that this is not the case.

Theorem 11.3. ([B2]) *In every odd dimension n , there is a phase function Ψ , which is a small real-analytic perturbation of some Ψ_Q , so that the inequality $\|Tf\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty(B^{n-1})}$ holds only in the range $p \geq 2 \cdot \frac{n+1}{n-1}$.*

In Bourgain's example, $|Tf|$ is concentrated into the 1-neighborhood of a low degree algebraic variety Z of dimension $\frac{n+1}{2}$. More precisely, in this example, $\|Tf\|_{L^2(N_1(Z) \cap B_R)} \sim \|Tf\|_{L^2(B_R)}$, and also $\|Tf\|_{L^2(B_R)} \sim R^{1/2}\|f\|_{L^2} \sim R^{1/2}\|f\|_{L^\infty}$.

In [B3], Bourgain proved that in every even dimension, every such operator T obeys slightly stronger estimates. More recently, the paper [BG] proved a sharp estimate for Hormander-type operators in every even dimension.

Theorem 11.4. ([BG]) *If T is a Hormander-type operator in dimension n , with n even, then $\|Tf\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty(B^{n-1})}$ for $p > 2 \cdot \frac{n+2}{n}$.*

In the sharp examples for this theorem, Tf is concentrated into the 1-neighborhood of a low degree algebraic variety Z of dimension $\frac{n+2}{2}$. The difference between even and odd dimensions comes about for the following reason. In the odd-dimensional examples we just discussed, all the wave packets compress into a small neighborhood of a smooth surface of dimension $\frac{n+1}{2}$, and this dimension is optimal. If n is odd, then $\frac{n+1}{2}$ is an integer, but if n is even, then $\frac{n+1}{2}$ is not an integer, and there is no such thing as a smooth surface of dimension $\frac{n+1}{2}$. In this case, it turns out that wave packets cannot compress into a rough fractal object of dimension $\frac{n+1}{2}$, and the smallest set where they can compress is a smooth surface of dimension $\frac{n+2}{2}$ - see Section 7 of [BG], on curved Keakey estimates.

Earlier, in [L], Lee made the important observation that when Q is positive definite, Theorem 11.2 can be improved substantially. He extended the Tao-Wolff bilinear estimate Theorem 1.2 to Hormander-type operators with positive definite phase. As a corollary he proved

Theorem 11.5. ([L]) *If T is a Hormander-type operator with positive definite phase, as in (11.2), then $\|Tf\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim_\epsilon R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^p(B^{n-1})}$ for $p \geq 2 \cdot \frac{n+2}{n}$.*

When $n = 3$, this result is sharp. It establishes Conjecture 11.1 for $n = 3$. Section 6 of [BG] compares the sharp examples for the positive definite phase with the sharp examples for general Hormander-type operators, in dimension 3. In both cases Tf is a sum of wave packets which concentrate near to a 2-dimensional variety Z . In both cases, the wave packets are curved tubes of length R and radius roughly $R^{1/2}$. In the positive definite case, Tf is concentrated into the $R^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of Z - in the sense that $\|Tf\|_{L^2(N_{R^{1/2}}(Z) \cap B_R)} \sim \|Tf\|_{L^2(B_R)}$, but this is false for any thickness $W \ll R^{1/2}$. However, in the case of non-positive definite Q , Tf is concentrated into the 1-neighborhood of Z - as we mentioned above $\|Tf\|_{L^2(N_1(Z) \cap B_R)} \sim \|Tf\|_{L^2(B_R)}$. Note that the 1-neighborhood of Z is much thinner than the wave packets, which have radius roughly $R^{1/2}$. The additional compression in the non-positive definite case comes about from positive interference between the wave packets. This different behavior in the direction transverse to Z is reminiscent of the transverse equidistribution estimate in this paper. If the wave packets $Ef_{\theta,v}$ concentrate in the $R^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of a variety Z , the transverse equidistribution estimate prevents Ef from concentrating into the W -neighborhood of Z for $W \ll R^{1/2}$.

We have discussed two features of an operator T that help control the L^p estimates that it obeys: the signature of the phase function and the parity of the dimension. Conjecture 11.1 combines these two effects.

11.2. Other extension operators. One could also try to apply the methods here to extension operators for other hypersurfaces besides the paraboloid. The case of the sphere, or other positively curved hypersurfaces, would follow easily from the variable-coefficient generalization discussed above. But it would be interesting to know if these methods apply to the cone or the hyperbolic paraboloid.

11.3. Honest k -linear estimates. Our main result, Theorem 1.5 is a weak version of the k -linear restriction estimate from Conjecture 1.4. For some purposes, we have seen that Theorem 1.5 is a good substitute for a k -linear restriction estimate, but there are surely other situations where an honest k -linear estimate is better. When I tried to prove Conjecture 1.4 using this method, I ran into the following problem. There are k different functions Ef_j to consider. It may happen that for some of these k functions, the wave packets of Ef_j are tangent to a variety Z , and for others of these k functions, the wave packets of Ef_j are transverse to the variety Z . I didn't find a good way to deal with this scenario. The k -broad norm, $\text{BL}_{k,A}^p$, is designed to get around this situation.

11.4. Takeya-type estimates for low degree varieties. We now return to the extension operator for the paraboloid. Theorem 1.5 gives essentially sharp broad L^p estimates of the form:

$$(11.7) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

We have seen that this estimate holds if and only if $p \geq \bar{p}(k, n)$. What if we consider other norms on the right-hand side? For some q larger than 2, can we prove an estimate

$$(11.8) \quad \|Ef\|_{\text{BL}_{k,A}^p(B_R)} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^q},$$

for some $p < \bar{p}(k, n)$?

In the introduction, we mentioned some sharp examples for Theorem 1.5. In these examples, the wave packets $Ef_{\theta,v}$ concentrate in the $R^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of a low degree variety Z . Let us consider the set of caps θ that can appear in this example. Define $\Theta(Z)$ as

$$\Theta(Z) := \{\theta \text{ so that for some } v, T_{\theta,v} \subset N_{R^{1/2+\delta}}(Z)\}.$$

In our example, f is supported in $\Omega(Z) := \cup_{\theta \in \Theta(Z)} \theta$. If $|\Omega(Z)| \ll 1$, then $\|f\|_{L^q} \gg \|f\|_{L^2}$ for all $q > 2$.

In fact, if we had good estimates for $|\Omega(Z)|$, then I believe we could input them into the proof of Theorem 1.5 to get some further estimates of the form (11.8), roughly following the argument in [G].

If Z is an m -dimensional plane, then it is easy to check that $|\Theta(Z)| \sim (R^{1/2})^{m-1}$ and so $|\Omega(Z)| \sim (R^{1/2})^{m-1} \cdot (R^{1/2})^{-(n-1)}$. It seems reasonable to conjecture that a similar bound holds for any m -dimensional variety Z of small degree:

Conjecture 11.6. *If Z is an m -dimensional variety in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of degree at most D , then*

$$(11.9) \quad |\Theta(Z)| \leq C(n, D, \epsilon) (R^{1/2})^{m-1+\epsilon}.$$

Conjecture 11.6 is a very special case of the Takeya conjecture. One variant of the Takeya conjecture goes as follows:

Conjecture 11.7. *(Takeya conjecture) Suppose that $X \subset B^n(1)$. Suppose that $T_i \subset X$ are tubes of length 1 and radius δ , pointing in δ -separated directions. Then*

$$\text{Number of tubes} \leq C(\epsilon) \delta^{-\epsilon} \frac{\text{Vol}(X)}{\text{Vol}(\text{tube})}.$$

(I haven't seen this exact version of the Kakeya conjecture in print before, but it's straightforward to check that the maximal function version of the Kakeya conjecture implies Conjecture 11.7, which implies the Minkowski dimension version of the Kakeya conjecture.) Now Conjecture 11.6 is just the special case of Conjecture 11.7 where the set X is the δ -neighborhood of a low degree algebraic variety.

Conjecture 11.6 also came up in ongoing joint work with Josh Zahl on the Kakeya problem in $\mathbb{R}^4$. I think it is a basic issue that comes up in trying to apply polynomial methods to the restriction problem or the Kakeya problem.

I initially expected that Conjecture 11.6 would be rather straightforward. But I have tried for a while, and I am not able to prove it. I was able to prove it in the case $n = 3$ in [G], but the proof there definitely does not generalize to higher dimensions. For a hypersurface $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^4$, I have not been able to prove the conjecture even for degree $D = 2$ or 3. (For $D = 2$, I think there is some hope to prove the conjecture by a brute force case analysis of all possible degree 2 hypersurfaces, but this strategy looks untenable for $D = 3$.)

REFERENCES

- [Be] I. Bejenaru, The optimal trilinear restriction estimate for a class of hypersurfaces with curvature, arXiv:1603.02965
- [B1] J. Bourgain, Besicovitch type maximal operators and applications to Fourier analysis. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 1 (1991), no. 2, 147-187.
- [B2] J. Bourgain, L^p -estimates for oscillatory integrals in several variables. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 1 (1991), no. 4, 321-374.
- [B3] J. Bourgain, Some new estimates on oscillatory integrals, *Annals Math. St.* 42, Princeton UP (1995), 83-112.
- [B4] J. Bourgain, Moment inequalities for trigonometric polynomials with spectrum in curved hypersurfaces. *Israel J. Math.* 193 (2013), no. 1, 441-458.
- [BD] J. Bourgain, C. Demeter, The proof of the l^2 decoupling conjecture. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 182 (2015), no. 1, 351-389.
- [BG] J. Bourgain, L. Guth, Bounds on oscillatory integral operators based on multilinear estimates. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 21 (2011), no. 6, 1239-1295.
- [BCT] J. Bennett, A. Carbery, and T. Tao, On the multilinear restriction and Kakeya conjectures. *Acta Math.* 196 (2006), no. 2, 261-302.
- [CKW] X. Chen, N. Kayal, and A. Wigderson, Partial derivatives in arithmetic complexity and beyond. *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.* 6 (2010), no. 1-2, pages 1-138 (2011).
- [CEGSW] K.L. Clarkson, H. Edelsbrunner, L. Guibas, M. Sharir, and E. Welzl, *Combinatorial Complexity bounds for arrangements of curves and spheres*, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* (1990) 5, 99-160.
- [D] Z. Dvir, On the size of Kakeya sets in finite fields. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 22 (2009), no. 4, 1093-1097.
- [GP] V. Guillemin and A. Pollack, *Differential Topology*, AMS Chelsea Publishing, 1974, reprinted 2010.
- [G] L. Guth, A restriction estimate using polynomial partitioning. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 29 (2016), no. 2, 371-413.
- [GK] L. Guth and N. Katz, On the Erdős distinct distances problem in the plane, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 181 (2015), no. 1, 155-190.
- [H] L. Hormander, Oscillatory integrals and multipliers on FL^p , *Arkiv Math.* II (1973), 1-11.
- [L] S. Lee, Linear and bilinear estimates for oscillatory integral operators related to restriction to hypersurfaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* 241:1 (2006), 56-98.
- [S] E. Stein, Some problems in harmonic analysis. *Harmonic analysis in Euclidean spaces* (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Williams Coll., Williamstown, Mass., 1978), Part 1, pp. 3-20, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., XXXV, Part, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1979.
- [S2] E. Stein, Oscillatory integrals in Fourier analysis, Beijing lectures in Harmonic Analysis, *Annals Math. St.* 112, Princeton UP (1986).
- [StTu] A. Stone, and J. Tukey, Generalized "sandwich" theorems. *Duke Math. J.* 9, (1942) 356-359.
- [TVV] T. Tao, A. Vargas, L. Vega, A bilinear approach to the restriction and Kakeya conjectures. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 11 (1998), no. 4, 967-1000.

- [T1] T. Tao, The Bochner-Riesz conjecture implies the restriction conjecture. *Duke Math. J.* 96 (1999), no. 2, 363-375.
- [T2] T. Tao, A sharp bilinear restrictions estimate for paraboloids. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 13 (2003), no. 6, 1359-1384.
- [W1] T. Wolff, A sharp bilinear cone restriction estimate. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 153 (2001), no. 3, 661-698.
- [W2] T. Wolff, Local smoothing type estimates on L^p for large p . *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 10 (2000), no. 5, 1237-1288.
- [W3] T. Wolff, A Keakey-type problem for circles. *Amer. J. Math.* 119 (1997), no. 5, 985-1026.
- [Wo] R. Wongkew, Volumes of tubular neighbourhoods of real algebraic varieties. *Pacific J. Math.* 159 (1993), no. 1, 177-184.